

THE ORIGINS OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF VALENCIA:
A STUDY IN MANAGEMENT ETHICS IN NEW CHURCH CONSTRUCTION

A Professional Project
Presented to
the Faculty of
the School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Kenneth Gordon Heaton
June 1976

This professional project, completed by

Kenneth Gordon Heaton

*has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

Faculty Committee

Amos

Harry Super

100% 99% 98% 97% 96% 95% 94% 93% 92% 91% 90% 89% 88% 87% 86% 85% 84% 83% 82% 81% 80% 79% 78% 77% 76% 75% 74% 73% 72% 71% 70% 69% 68% 67% 66% 65% 64% 63% 62% 61% 60% 59% 58% 57% 56% 55% 54% 53% 52% 51% 50% 49% 48% 47% 46% 45% 44% 43% 42% 41% 40% 39% 38% 37% 36% 35% 34% 33% 32% 31% 30% 29% 28% 27% 26% 25% 24% 23% 22% 21% 20% 19% 18% 17% 16% 15% 14% 13% 12% 11% 10% 9% 8% 7% 6% 5% 4% 3% 2% 1% 0%

May 3, 1976
Date

James C. Hough, Jr.
Dean

PREFACE

The possibility of applying a business analysis approach to the construction of a new church arose while taking a course titled, "Management Process in the Local Church," taught by Robert Arnott at the Claremont extension classes held at Sherman Oaks United Methodist Church. The concept grew into a topic for a professional project.

Several years ago while a seminary student in Missouri, the writer served as a "guinea pig" for a study at the University of Kansas. From the hours of testing taken at that time he was advised that his keenest interests lay in the field of business management; that insight had been forgotten and has lain dormant until undertaking the present assignment. For some, graduate school projects serve as psychoanalyses and are not only purgative, but also redemptive. Such has been the case with the present undertaking.

Theological undergirding for the writer's position has come from several sources. John Cobb, Jr. proclaims the good news

that the Creator-Lord of history is not the all-determinative cause of natural and historical events, but a lover of the world who calls it ever beyond what it has attained by affirming life, novelty, consciousness, and freedom, again and again.¹

¹John B. Cobb, Jr., God and the World (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 65.

Further he notes that

the Lawgiver is not the source of arbitrary, imposed moral rules, established once and for all from on high, but the establisher of ever-new possibilities of righteousness which both destroy and fulfill generalizations based upon the past.²

Joseph Fletcher has suggested that "it is love's business to calculate gains and losses, and to act for the sake of its success."³ Elsewhere he insists that "only the end justifies the end: nothing else."⁴ Such was not the teaching that this writer received in childhood, but it does concur with what he has observed in life through the years. With humor K. Morgan Edwards has written in the same vein that "bishops and presidents, ministers and political leaders, when given power, all suspect that they rule by divine right."⁵ That things are not as they appear to be is no new discovery, but it is always disconcerting. "We want men with principles," used to be the battle cry; today it is more apt to be, "We want 'peopled' principles!"

From the perspective of the business world

Douglas McGregor has warned that people do not

behave as individuals in terms of competitive self-interest. . . . They create informal alliances . . . to further organizational goals, . . . and sometimes

²Ibid.

³Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 132.

⁴Ibid., p. 133.

⁵K. Morgan Edwards, Hoping to Be Somebody (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 30.

to defeat them Cooperative relationships are established to circumvent the formal organizational requirements. Many, but not all, of these are ways of getting the job done in spite of what managers perceive as hampering formal requirements.⁶

Getting the job done in love has been the guiding principle in the establishment of the new parish whose story is told in part on the following pages. Peter Drucker claims that he "long ago learned not to be nice, because people do not hear it when you hint."⁷ and so perhaps the message on many of the pages may appear not to be nice, but it is nonetheless needful for a better understanding of how one church came to be built.

"Be angry and sin not," admonishes the Scripture.⁸ Frequently the writer of these pages was motivated by anger; perhaps a study of how Jesus used anger would make a fitting dissertation, but this task will be left to others. It is the purpose of the present undertaking to give a history of business transactions in the establishment of a church and to critically analyze how to better affect the same results in the future, should the opportunity be given--God grant that it may be given to others, and not this writer! In addition to analyzing the author attempts to indicate a

⁶Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 35.

⁷Peter F. Drucker, Technology, Management and Society (London: Chaucer Press, 1970), p. 102.

⁸Ephesians 4:26.

progression of thought as evidenced by his sermons which are included in the appendix.

Finally courage and comfort is given to write these pages by a few lines in Haynes and Massie's Management:

Analysis, Concepts and Cases:

Assuming that morale is always conducive to productivity (and probably it usually is), this does not mean that it is all to the good. Recently, critics of the human relations literature have suggested that complacent, conformist "organization men" are the result of the effort to make everyone feel at home at his workplace. There is still room, even on management levels, for the irritable, irritating, rude, imaginative, driving,⁹ individualist who does not care what people think.

And at least one professing Christian believes there is a place in the management of the Church for "the irritable, irritating," and yes sometimes, even "rude, imaginative, driving individualist," like St. Paul, Martin Luther and John Wesley, "who does not care what people think" about him so long as his motivation ultimately is the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, regardless of how outdated some may think the concept is. He it is who writes these lines.

William H. Marnell has written that

the leader of a Methodist band knew what authority and responsibility meant; the members of a band understood the law of charity. Their good life rested on the ancient values and the primitive Christian principles. . . . Methodists became trade unionists and for a time at least a certain moral fervor was instilled in the

⁹W. Warren Haynes and Joseph L. Massie, Management Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961). p. 13.

union movement. . . . Methodism . . . demonstrated the possible affinity between religious dedication and political reform.¹⁰

"The leaders of the factory acts movement . . . were all influenced by Methodism."¹¹ ". . . It is significant that the speakers at miners' meetings were Methodists."¹² In an age when we are warned that more does not mean better, it behoves us to reread the history of the Methodist societies and to recall that "Methodism made men better citizens and some even better rebels."¹³ Where early Methodists went preaching and building churches, lives and communities and nations were redeemed.

In 1801 there were 825 Methodist meeting houses in England, and in 1850 there were 11,000; the Methodists numbered 90,000 in 1801 and 358,000 in 1850. . . . It would hardly be accurate to say that the meek Methodists had inherited the earth, but at least they were doing distinctly better than . . .¹⁴

any other religious bodies in England who had preceded them.

¹⁰William H. Marnell, The Good Life of Western Man (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971), p. 150.

¹¹Oscar Sherwin, John Wesley Friend of the People (New York: Twayne, 1961), p. 182

¹²Ibid., p. 183.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Marnell, p. 150

" . . . Not to pursue a detailed program for the future is dangerous and frightening. . . . To trust God and live in daily obedience is neither to deny him nor to accept defeat."¹⁵

Churches must be planned and must be built, even when the motivations of the builders are questioned. Malachi Martin has written of Cardinal Bea regarding the Cardinal's death that

he had been purified. Anything of contempt and anger for the opposition his wishes encountered, his onetime compromises in dilemmas, his fear of human respect, or the occasional wisps of vanity -- all this had been purged from him by the abuse of his detractors, the heartbreak he suffered at the hands of those in the Vatican administration who undermined his position, the contradictions thrown at him by his enemies and opponents, the frustrations of his good intentions, and the painful obligation he had to shoulder responsibility for decisions that he was not allowed to make but whose consequences he was obliged to bear.¹⁶

It is the prayer of this writer that the experiences learned from the realities detailed herein will sensitize him increasingly to encourage others who share in the life of the institutional church. "The fundamental point is that the good life of the minority called to posts of authority and responsibility is the good life of service."¹⁷

The purpose of this study is three-fold: (1) to set forth a history to date of the United Methodist Church of

¹⁵Robert E. Chiles, Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790-1935 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 206.

¹⁶Malachi Martin, Three Popes and the Cardinal (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972), p. 249.

¹⁷Marnell, p. 236.

Valencia, (2) to indicate that a set system of formalized ethics is beyond the scope of human production, and though situation ethics presented new hope for the pilgrim people of God in Valencia, a transcendent emphasis must be retained in any Christian ethic, and (3) to attempt to analyze the functioning of a new church, a pastor, a building committee and Conference officials caught up in the agony of giving birth to a new institution, the United Methodist Church of Valencia. The attempt to analyze is from the perspective of business management principles.

The guidance and inspiration of Robert Arnott and Harvey Seifert in the writing of this project have been greatly appreciated.

The writing of these pages is dedicated to Ray, whose brief life and acquaintance challenged the writer to complete the tasks described on the following pages, and to Don, who used his years of experience in the business world to further the business of the kingdom of God in Valencia, and to Dallas, who shared his insights from industry and firm faith in God's ultimate victory with his minister-friend in late and lonely hours, and to the 106 members of the United Methodist Church of Valencia who met the minister and encouraged him in 1972 and to the more than 200 who joined with them during the planning and construction phases of the church, and to

my family, who learned to live their own lives in my absence
and loved me nonetheless in these past three years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA-ARIZONA ANNUAL CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF VALENCIA.	1
Thatcher Jordan, 1967-1968	4
Lawrence A. Hinshaw, 1968-1969	5
Fletcher Scharer, 1969-1970.	10
Lawrence A. Hinshaw, 1970-1974	15
Elias G. Galvan, 1974-1976	20
Summary.	20
2. PLANNING TO BUILD.	22
First Sixty Days	22
Building Committee Organization.	27
Program for the Architect.	30
Owner-Builder Construction Plan.	32
Conference	33
Conference Plans for Missions.	38
Church Extension in the National Division.	40
Alternatives Considered by the Building Committee.	42
The Question of Ethics	46
Summary.	50
3. FINANCING FOR CONSTRUCTION	52
The Sale of the Parsonage.	53
The Capital Funds Crusades	59
Mortgages.	60
Conference Donations	67
Summary.	71
4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH	72
Grading.	73
The Electrical Contract.	75
The Air-Conditioning Contract.	76
Bouquet Canyon, Split-Face Walls	77
Painting and Pews.	78
Cabinets and Clean-Up.	80
Landscaping.	81
Inflation.	83
Supervision of Construction.	83
Summary of Savings in Construction Costs	84
Materials Donated During Course of Construction.	85
Some Reflections on the Construction of the Church	85

5. REFLECTIONS ON CONSTRUCTION	88
Proposed Solutions to Rapid Turnover of Leadership. .	91
Guidance for the Planning Phase of the Church Building	95
Escrow Officer.	98
Written Commitments	100
On Site Supervision	102
Staff for the Mission Church.	102
Communication with Conference Officials	104
Maintaining Morale.	116
Summary	122
6. ETHICS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH.	125
Business Ethics	128
Situation Ethics.	129
Possible Solution to the Question of Ethical Systems.	134
7. MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH CONSTRUCTION.	137
Unity of Command.	138
Span of Control	141
The Exception Principle	144
The Scalar Principle.	145
Summary of Traditional Organizational Principles. . .	147
Pastoral Authority.	147
Schools of Business Management.	149
Classical School or "Scientific Management.	149
The Human Relations School.	150
Structuralism	151
The Systems Theory.	152
Local Church Errors in Planning, Financing and Construction.	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	158
Books	159
Periodicals	163
Journals.	163
Interviews.	163
Minutes of Meetings	164
Letters	165
APPENDIX.	167
A. Memorial Service for Raymond V. Greenlee 1938-1972	168
B. Congregational Questionnaire Results.	175
C. Considerations for Building	178
D. A Program for the Architect	182
E. Report to the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee on Housing.	186
F. The Sermons	189

Why I Believe in the Church.	189
Getting Things Done.	196
INDEX.	203
VITA	214

ABSTRACT

The United Methodist Church of Valencia, California built a facility for worship seven years after the purchase of land by the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference. Five district superintendents, three pastors, three Conference treasurers, two executive-secretaries of the national board of missions, and two executive-secretaries of the Conference board of missions and church extension, and two bishops, all with differing attitudes toward new church construction, held office and interpreted denominational policy for the local church during the seven years under consideration (1968-1975).

Conference and national rules relating to new church construction were unclear and outdated. New church construction suffered from "sociological interests" of the church on the national and Conference level. Annual funding for new churches in the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference dropped from \$675,000 to \$160,000. According to the statements of national church executives church extension was "sick."

The local church pastor and building committee assessed their prospects, plotted their action, and achieved their goal of the construction of an attractive facility for worship only after considerable delays caused by denominational demagogues and county bureaucrats. Conference commitments to costs varied from superintendent to superintendent, and from executive to executive, and

from time to time. In response to the fluctuations of interpretation of policy by the annual Conference leadership the local church building committee developed a commitment to situational ethics. One would have expected business ethics to have obtained in the minds of the building committee, which was composed of business managers, but apparently exposure to three years' preaching on situation ethics opened up new concepts for Christian decision-making.

While the Church is more than a business, it does employ the principles of business management in its day-to-day functioning, consciously or unconsciously. Stability of pastoral leadership can open the possibility of more effective leadership.

This study calls for much more local church autonomy in decisions relating to new church construction than presently exists in the stated policies of the annual Conference. It also indicated the need for more expertise in new church establishment and construction. More attention needs to be given to consideration of home ownership and salary of mission church pastors.

Chapter 1

HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA-ARIZONA
ANNUAL CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF VALENCIA

Historically the word administration would not normally be used in relation to the leadership of the Christian Church though today it is widely used, recognizing that more is involved than mere pastoral oversight. Since many persons, ministerial and lay, as well as boards and committees, are presented in this study, and since attention is directed toward management process, the term administration is selected. In many respects the church is a business and cannot escape that image.

But the Church will be heading for disaster if it abandons itself to its visible aspects and, forgetful of its true nature, puts itself on the same level as other institutions. It would be fatal for the Church to see itself primarily as a powerful factor in public life . . . as a slightly more pious pressure group among other pressure groups, competing with others for power in politics, the arts, education and economics. If it did this the Church would be abdicating as a Church, forgetting the crucial element which alone can make its visible aspects into a true Church: the Spirit, which invisibly contrast the visible Church, making it spiritually alive, fruitful and credible.¹

The Church is a business, but more than a business.

Truly, "the Church is of God and will be preserved

¹Hans Küng, The Church (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 37.

to the end of time . . . ,"² as a visible institution with commitments and responsibilities to all mankind. "Better organization, increased human effort, modernization of methods -- all good in themselves -- do not build the church,"³ but because of the weight of its responsibility to the world the Church must seek efficiency of operation. Donald G. Miller has rightly written that

the central aim of the church, therefore, is . . . costly action in God's warfare against evil, looking forward to that day when the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever (Revelation 11:15).⁴

It is to be hoped that the Church will fare better in the world than secular business does today.

Surveys of business failures over the past few decades, made by Dun and Bradstreet and other firms, indicate that chances are that half of all new businesses will close their doors within 2 years. By 5 years about 80 percent of them will have failed.⁵

Viewed in this vein the Church has been a successful business in America in the past two hundred years.

The history covered in this chapter reflects the period from the initial investigation of land purchase through to the planning phase for construction of the first

²From "The Order for Confirmation and Reception into the Church" liturgy of the United Methodist Church.

³Donald G. Miller, The Nature and Mission of the Church (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1957), pp. 16-17

⁴Ibid., p. 20.

⁵Anthony Scaduto, Handling Your Money (New York: McKay, 1963), p. 14.

unit built in Valencia. This period covers eight calendar years. God forbid that this should be deemed a normal time frame for the development of a United Methodist parish!

Neighboring churches have moved much more rapidly in constructing their first units. The Friendly Valley United Methodist Church of Newhall, a neighboring community, purchased land one year and began construction the next. One would think that this should be the norm.

A rapid sucession of district superintendents, pastors and Conference administrators contributed to uncertain policies as will be indicated on the following pages. Undoubtedly each person and committee had good plans and intentions, but communication of plans and intentions appear to have been blurred from time to time. With the assignment of five district superintendents in eight years, three pastors in four years, four different building committees, three Conference treasurers, and two executive-secretaries of the Board of Missions and Church Extension in the Conference combined with two executive-secretaries in the national division of the church, one marvels that anything of permanence was accomplished. Perhaps this is a tribute to the continuity of policy possible in the connectional structure of the United Methodist Church.

Thatcher Jordan, 1967-1968

In 1967 Thatcher Jordan, district superintendent of the Santa Barbara District of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, and Will Hildebrand, executive-secretary of the Board of Missions and Church Extension, approached the California Land Company (later known as the Newhall Land and Farming Company) with the intention of purchasing three acres of land in Valencia, California, a yet-to-be-built new city on the old Newhall Ranch, a tract of 44,000 acres. The three acre Methodist purchase was to be used for the establishment of new Methodist church. A brief outline of Conference policy regarding the establishment of new churches was given by Jordan in a letter to Peter C. Kremer, sales officer of the California Land Company.

. . . The Methodist Church has been granted number one priority in the Valencia development by the Commission on Church Planning of the Council of Churches of Southern California. Our desire is to purchase a site approximately three acres in size fully developed.

Our intention is to purchase a house and appoint a pastor to serve the area as soon as enough people are available to support a new congregation. Following the appointment of a pastor it would require a year or two to gain sufficient support to build a first unit on the property.

The policy of our Conference Board of Missions is to advance funds to purchase a building site and a parsonage and to make possible a loan to build the first unit. Funds to carry the ten year loan must be raised by the congregation.⁶

⁶Personal correspondence between Thatcher Jordan and Peter Kremer, December 28, 1967.

Thus, the overtures were made for a land purchase upon which the United Methodist Church of Valencia was built.

Four months later Jordan and Kremer met again to view building sites, and subsequently Kremer mailed maps to Jordan, proposing two possible locations for a church.⁷ Hildebrand was out of town at the time,⁸ and it was not possible to make a selection in his absence. Two and a half months later Jordan returned to the pastorate, and Lawrence A. Hinshaw replaced him as superintendent.

Lawrence A. Hinshaw, 1968-1969

In October Hinshaw visited the proposed site on McBean Parkway. Obviously he was concerned by the fact that the back of the lot fell away from the elevation of the street. Kremer attempted to give reassurance. He wrote:

Fill dirt could be made available The cost of hauling and placing of fill dirt would be the responsibility and expense of the buyer. The ditch running across the parcel appears to cause no developmental problems and would be eliminated by your on site grading.⁹

Seven years later when the time for construction came the fill dirt was available -- one mile away, and the estimated cost of moving it to the construction site was \$30,000.¹⁰ This cost would provide only enough dirt to

⁷Ibid., April 25, 1968.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰A verbal bid given by Mr. William Small, Grading Contractor, Newhall, California, in the fall of 1973.

raise the elevation of the church floor one foot above curb level. Without fill dirt the church would have been built four feet below curb level, greatly diminishing the commanding appearance it gives to passers-by. The ditch running across the property necessitated extensive grading and compaction as well as soil tests. Grading cost \$5,000 and soil tests were \$1,000.¹¹

It appears that Hinshaw was aware of the potential costs, and Kremer attempted to allay his fears. Hinshaw was not easily put off, and on October 11, 1968 he wrote to Kremer.

We are still of the opinion that if fill dirt is required for the site in question it should be brought to grade by the developer. . . . We do not have any guarantee about what our neighbors would be like on the undeveloped portion of the land. Can you assure us what the intent is of your plan at present?¹²

Two weeks later Kremer advised Hinshaw that the land could not be purchased until a year later, "depending on the rate of home sales."¹³ In fact the land had not yet been acquired by the California Land Company; it was owned by Newhall Land and Farming Company.¹⁴ It now appears that

¹¹It should be noted that the church paid only \$400 in cash for these services. The rest was obscured by being included in the contractor's bid.

¹²Personal correspondence between Lawrence A. Hinshaw and Peter Kremer, October 11, 1968.

¹³Ibid., October 29, 1968

¹⁴Ibid.

the California Land Company was the sales agent for Newhall Land and Farming. Realizing that the proposed site could not be acquired readily, Hinshaw explored other possibilities.

Correspondence indicates that Olsens Realtors of Newhall attempted to interest him in purchasing a site on Valley Street in Newhall. He replied to Olsens:

. . . While it is a nice parcel, it is probably not going to serve the Valencia community, and it is my feeling that the Baptist Church across the street probably serves the immediate area quite well.

You should know that we are in conversation with the Episcopal Church about the possibility of doing a joint ministry of some kind. And there is a liklihood that we will proceed with the purchase of the parcel on McBean Parkway.¹⁵

It would appear possible that Kremer was aware of the apparent anxiety on the part of the Methodists to purchase land in 1968 and not to be put off until 1969. The site in Valencia which Hinshaw desired was part of an eight acre plot known as St. John's Subdivision. At \$40,000 an acre there was a good profit to be made from dealing with the Methodists in 1968. Eight years later adjacent would sell for only \$20,000 an acre.¹⁶ In less than one week from the time he indicated that the land would not be available for

¹⁵Ibid.,

¹⁶Price paid by Hart School District for Meadows School and proposed price to be paid the Glen School.

another year Kremer presented Hinshaw with an Agreement to Purchase¹⁷ for the two and one-half acres Hinshaw desired.

Before signing the Agreement to Purchase Hinshaw questioned the availability of utilities, fire hydrants, and block walls as required by Los Angeles County.¹⁸ There is no record of any answers being given by the seller, and these issues still plagued the new congregation eight years later. The question of land use and zoning variance appear not to have been raised. Six years later this oversight cost the church eight months delay in construction time while building costs were rising at the rate of \$1,000 per week. By February 10, 1969 Anthony V. Randles, Attorney and Counselor at Law, acting on behalf of the Conference Board of Missions and Church Extension, had given his approval to the conditions of the Agreement to Purchase.¹⁹ On April 2, 1969 George Williams, Conference Treasurer, forwarded to the California Land Company an initial payment of \$10,000 with the understanding that a parcel map would be filed with Los Angeles County by the seller.²⁰ No

¹⁷Personal correspondence between Peter Kremer and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, November 4, 1968.

¹⁸Ibid., November 25, 1968

¹⁹Personal correspondence between Anthony V. Randles and Dr. Will Hildebrand, February 10, 1969.

²⁰Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Edward A. Toney, Administrative Assistant, California Land Company, April 2, 1969.

Conference official or agent pursued the filing of that map, and five years later a zoning variance had to be filed and required eight months for approval. When the issue was raised by the pastor of the church in 1973 the Newhall Land and Farming Company (successor to the California Land Company) rushed in, surveyed the church site and filed the map. More pressing concerns took the time of Conference officials.

On May 15, 1969 Hildebrand expressed several of these concerns in a letter to Hinshaw.

This material needs to be checked out concerning the Valencia property. I think they should give us a map showing all these easements. If they are through the middle of the property, it is a serious matter. If they encroach on our property as much as 40' even on one side, we need to study it carefully. It is possible they encroach on two sides. I cannot tell by the description.

Make a date with our man out there and get a clear picture what all this means.

It may be they can be removed, though I doubt it.²¹

It appears that Hinshaw was in immediate conversation with Kremer, who on May 19 wrote that "we will endeavor to clear up and encumbrances that prohibit or substantially impair the use of the site for a church facility."²²

²¹Personal correspondence between Will M. Hildebrand and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, May 15, 1969.

²²Personal correspondence between Peter Kremer and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, May 19, 1969.

On the same day Hildebrand wrote to Hinshaw:

Larry: This escrow is up in the air. Call Kremer and ask him if the map is prepared. We should get a meeting with them and go over this escrow in regard to the encumbrances.²³

Hildebrand was not the only Conference official concerned over the issues involved in the purchase of the Valencia property; however, Hinshaw would soon be out of the picture. At the annual Conference of June, 1969 Valencia became part of the Pasadena District of which Fletcher Scharer was the superintendent.

Fletcher Scharer, 1969-1970

As Hinshaw passed responsibility on to Scharer for the purchase of the Valencia property he wrote on July 2, 1969:

Fletcher: Mr. Kremer said man in charge is on vacation 2 more weeks.

Kremer will expedite and be in touch with us. Larry.²⁴
Scharer wanted to know the details of the land purchase in Valencia. Also George Williams, Conference Comptroller, wrote to Hinshaw:

I am completely lost to know where we are in connection with the purchase of the Valencia property. I am holding several copies of the amendments to the title report issued by Title Insurance and Trust Company. I would hope that we can get most of the details worked out before I leave on vacation on the 17th of July.

²³Letter, May 19, 1969.

²⁴Personal correspondence between Lawrence A. Hinshaw and Fletcher Scharer, July 2, 1969.

Therefore, I would appreciate it if you and Hildebrand and Scharer can get together and come to some understanding of where we are so that this matter can be completed.²⁵

This letter was addressed July 3, 1969. The Reverend David Taylor had just been appointed pastor of the United Methodist Church of Valencia, effective July 1, 1969. As a former attorney he was able to lend his expertise in resolving the property transaction, and so he wrote to J. Wesley Hole, Conference Treasurer on August 6 that the legal description of the property was accurate. The taxes had not been certified. All parties with easements had executed Quit-Claim Deeds, and "a proported easement granted by Newhall Land and Farming Company to Southern California Gas Company was found by survey not to affect this property."²⁶ Thus, the Board of Missions and Church Extension acquired two and one-half acres of land on which to build a church in Valencia at a cost of \$103,000. The deal was consummated on August 11, 1969.²⁷

Taylor and Hinshaw had already been at work in acquiring a parsonage for the new parish -- a six bedroom, three bath, 3200 square foot home in The Hills of Valencia.

²⁵Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, July 3, 1969.

²⁶Personal correspondence between David Taylor and J. Wesley Hole, August 6, 1969.

²⁷Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Charles Van Cleave, Title Insurance and Trust Company of Los Angeles, August 11, 1969.

Williams had advanced a \$1,000 deposit on the property on June 12, 1969 even though the

"Conference Board of Missions has not technically approved the purchase of the property nor the advancement of the \$1,000 but in order to hold the home we are issuing the check at this time."²⁸

Apparently the Conference Board of Missions approved the purchase, and the escrow was closed on September 18, 1969.²⁹

In October 1969 the first meeting for the organization of a new church was held in the living room of the Valencia parsonage. A further meeting was held in Newhall park. Dr. Lester L. Hiebert, assistant superintendent of the Hart School District and a Methodist recently transplanted from Indio, California, was instrumental in getting use of Placerita Junior High School multipurpose room for the new congregation. Bishop Gerald Kennedy came for the formal organization of the church, and forty-four charter members were recorded. Hiebert became the lay leader. Membership increased to 122 by the following June. Taylor consulted with Robert H. Ricciardi, A.I.A. during the final day of annual Conference in June of 1970, and initial architectural concepts were developed at a cost of \$2,000. An all steel first unit was proposed with a 500 seat sanctuary to follow the next year. Three

²⁸Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and David Taylor, June 12, 1969.

²⁹Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Tonia Henson, Valley Federal Savings & Loan, 9/18/69.

years later Hildebrand termed the plans "wild," but apparently he held his peace at the time.³⁰

During his stay in Valencia Taylor frequently spent Monday through Friday selling oil stocks throughout California and Oklahoma. Eventually the scheme he was involved in was termed illegal. He was arrested, tried, and convicted of selling fraudulent stocks. His arrest came in November of 1970, and Fred A. Brossmer was appointed pastor.

One of Brossmer's first surprises was to learn that the Annual Conference was using building funds donated to the Valencia church with which to pay taxes on the building site. \$10,000 had been donated for construction costs, but Williams advised that

the taxes for the year 1970-71 on the parsonage property and church site at Valencia amount to \$1,929.81 and \$1,268.69 respectively. . . .

It would appear proper for the church to refund the amount which has been paid by the Conference Board of Missions on these taxes. If they are not refunded then this amount will, of course, be deducted from the donation which the Conference Board of Missions has made on the first unit.³²

During the Conference year, 1969-1970 the Valencia congregation had raised a total of \$3,541.³³ Now it was

³⁰Personal interview with Dr. Hildebrand by Kenneth G. Heaton.

³¹Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Fred A. Brossmer, November 30, 1970.

³²Ibid.

³³Southern California-Arizona Conference, (1971), p. 563.

being asked to repay the Conference \$3,198.50 for taxes. The effect on morale was devastating.³⁴ Little more than one month later the Valencia church was charged \$811.56 interest on the building site which was still owned by the Board of Missions and Church Extension.³⁵ Seventeen members withdrew their memberships, and four transferred to other denominations due to differences of opinion over Taylor's guilt and treatment by Conference officials.³⁶ The eighteen-month-old church closed 1970 with a membership of fifty-one,³⁷ just seven more than there had been when the charter was closed in October of 1969.

1971 began with bright hopes. Robert Duncan, A.I.A., of Van Nuys was engaged as architect, and preliminary sketches were begun for a modest 3,444 square foot, multipurpose building which would cost \$40,000 to \$60,000.³⁸

³⁴The following August a senior minister in the Conference, Arthur Nagel, father-in-law of Brossmer, advised him that the Valencia situation was hopeless, according to Father Russell Minter, vicar of St. Stephen's Episcopal Mission, Valencia.

³⁵Statement mailed to the Valencia church from the Conference treasurer, January 8, 1971.

³⁶Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1971), p. 560.

³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Council on Ministries Minutes, The United Methodist Church of Valencia, March 6, 1972.

Ricciardi was paid \$2,000³⁹ out of Conference funds for the work he had done previously for Taylor, which originally was designated building funds for Valencia. By the year's end \$7,179.51⁴⁰ of the original \$10,000 gift was used for taxes, interest, insurance, and architect's fees for buildings which were never built.

On July 1, 1971 Valencia was again considered part of the Santa Barbara District under the supervision of Lawrence A. Hinshaw. Could it be that Hinshaw was again given supervision of the mission because of its slow development? Westlake Village United Methodist Church had been started at the same time as Valencia. It reported a membership of 196 at the conclusion of 1970.⁴¹

Lawrence A. Hinshaw, 1971-75

During 1971 the Valencia Methodists moved from the Seventh Day Adventist Church to St. Stephen's Episcopal Church in Valencia. The Seventh Day Adventist Church had appeared like a workable solution to the problem of housing a new congregation after initially meeting at Placerita Junior High School multipurpose room; however, the Methodists were restricted to one hour's use on Sunday only.

³⁹Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Fred Brossmer, March 1, 1971.

⁴⁰Ibid., November 30, 1971.

⁴¹Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1971), p. 580.

St. Stephen's offered use of their church to the Methodists any time it was not occupied by the Episcopalians. Rent was the same as it had been at the Seventh Day Adventist Church, and Brossmer was offered office space to share with Father Russell Minter, vicar of St. Stephen's. The Methodists and Episcopalians were much alike in doctrine and polity, and so a harmonious relationship soon existed. In fact negotiations were entered into for dual ownership. The Episcopalians were in financial difficulty. In four years they had paid nothing either on interest or principal on their church.

On January 25, 1972 the Conference advised Brossmer that financial support of \$11,751⁴² would be terminated on June 30.⁴³ During 1971 the Valencia Methodists raised a total of \$13,331.⁴⁴ The mood of pastor and people is perhaps best reflected in an item of business on the agenda of the February 28 Council of Ministries' meeting: "Why Exist as a Church?" In July of 1972 Brossmer withdrew from the active ministry of the United Methodist Church to return to his former profession of public school teaching.⁴⁵

⁴²Personal correspondence between George Williams and Fred Brossmer, July 24, 1971.

⁴³Ibid., January 25, 1972.

⁴⁴Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1972), p. 559.

⁴⁵Father Minter of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church announced his resignation from the pastoral ministry the same morning that Brossmer withdrew.

During July, August, September and half of October the church functioned without a resident minister. A congregational meeting was convened to discuss the merits of continuing as opposed to dissolution of the mission.⁴⁶ The majority elected to continue in their efforts to establish a United Methodist Church in Valencia. Raymond and Virginia Greenlee threw themselves into the work of the church school and youth fellowship. Orren Harris assumed leadership of a youth group originally activated by Brossmer in the neighborhood of the parsonage. Cliff Cunningham and Nancy Leathers became teachers of the Sunday morning youth class. Later Raymond Greenlee confessed, "I moved in and took over, 'though I held no office giving me authority to do so, but I was afraid the organization would fall apart."⁴⁷ Donald H. Cravener, Jr., one of the original trustees, who signed the incorporation papers, called Hinshaw, demanding that effective leadership be assigned to Valencia. He faulted the Conference for sending the church, first a former criminal, and secondly an unseasoned novice. Now he demanded experienced pastoral leadership with the threat that he would personally spearhead an effort to disband the church.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Personal interview with Donald H. Cravener, Jr., Edith Walters, David Mastroleo, et al, conducted by Kenneth G. Heaton.

⁴⁷Personal interview with Raymond V. Greenlee, conducted by Kenneth G. Heaton.

⁴⁸Personal interview with Donald H. Cravener, Jr., conducted by Kenneth G. Heaton.

Hinshaw considered several solutions to the problem of leadership in Valencia. Merger with St. Stephen's Episcopal Church was discussed with the assistant to the Episcopal Bishop of the diocese of Los Angeles.⁴⁹ At the other extreme existed the possible formation of a new circuit -- Valencia and Granada Hills Knollwood churches. Under consideration was the appointment of a young man, two years out of seminary and on the staff of a large church.⁵⁰ He was almost packed to move to Valencia when Hinshaw heard from a colleague⁵¹ about a man, new to the Conference with sixteen years pastoral experience, who had built churches or purchased property wherever he had been.⁵² Hinshaw contacted the man's superintendent, who called the pastor and invited him to visit Valencia and report back his inclinations regarding the possibility of being appointed there. The man visited Valencia and reported back the same day that he had no desire to move to Valencia.

Three weeks later Hinshaw called the pastor himself, requesting a ten-o'clock-at-night meeting in a Denny's Restaurant on Sand Canyon Road in Canyon Country with the appeal, "Just let me tell my side of the story." At the

⁴⁹Personal interview of Lawrence A. Hinshaw with Kenneth G. Heaton.

⁵⁰Personal conversation between William Walles and Kenneth G. Heaton.

⁵¹Larry L. Stamper.

⁵²In a moment of weakness these facts were divulged to Fletcher Scharer at an informal dinner gathering.

conclusion of that meeting the pastor, the Reverend Kenneth G. Heaton, associate minister of the Lancaster United Methodist Church, requested permission from Hinshaw to meet with the Pastor-Parish Relations' Committee of the Valencia church before being assigned there. Hinshaw agreed to a meeting with the Pastor-Parish Relations on the following evening in the home of Dr. Lester L. Hiebert, lay leader of the church.

The following evening Kenneth G. Heaton from Lancaster met with the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee in Valencia and was well impressed with the quality of leadership evident in the people present. He agreed that he was pleased with the parsonage, but believed it should be the personal property of the pastor. He then turned to the matter of pastoral support and indicated that he felt it should be equivalent to that of the average family in the Valencia Hills. When no one seemed shocked he explained that if he should be selected to come to Valencia he would expect that these matters should be resolved before construction could begin on a new church. It was his observation that new churches in building programs have a rapid succession of pastors because they fail to plan to provide adequate ministerial support. He cited the example of Westlake Village where the Conference had sent in an experienced church organizer from the National Board of Missions on a salary of \$14,000, while in Valencia the pastors appointed in the previous eighteen months had both

been driven to seek outside employment because they had received only minimum salary. Taylor had sold stocks and Brossmer had taught school. Heaton was appointed to Valencia on October 10, 1972.

Growth in membership and finances came rapidly, and Hinshaw proved to be one hundred per cent supportive. In June of 1974 Hinshaw was succeeded by Elias G. Galvan.

Elias G. Galvan

Elias G. Galvan has been superintendent for the past two years. This chapter has sought to give an overview of the personalities involved in the administration of the United Methodist Church of Valencia in its formative years. The next chapter will deal with issues that arose during planning.

Summary

Between the time of the initial overtures for the purchase of land in Valencia and the time construction began on the first unit no less than five superintendents had given direction to the project. They were: Thatcher Jordan (1967-68), Lawrence A. Hinshaw (1968-69), Fletcher Scharer (1969-70), Lawrence A. Hinshaw (1970-74), and Elias G. Galvan (1974-75). Pastoral leadership had been given by three men: David Taylor, Fred Brossmer, and Kenneth G. Heaton. J. Wesley Hole had been Conference treasurer when the land was purchased. He was succeeded by George Williams.

Williams was replaced by John Kirkman in April, 1975. Hildebrand⁵³ served as executive-secretary of the Board of Missions and Church Extension until his retirement in June, 1975 and was succeeded by William Rollins.

On the local level Taylor engaged his trustees as a building committee; Brossmer elected a building committee, and Heaton elected two building committees in succeeding years. Three building concepts reflecting the three periods of leadership were presented to the congregation before a fourth plan was accepted.

Church efficiency experts, Engstrom and MacKenzie, have said that "an issue which is omnipresent but seldom faced in Christian organizations is that of tolerance of waste and inefficiency."⁵⁴ Obviously the rapid turn-over of leadership and policies did little to aid in the establishment of the United Methodist Church of Valencia.

⁵³Just prior to leaving office Hildebrand had cautioned, "You will have to lean on Dick Brooks, chairman of District Board of Building and Location, because Galvan knows nothing about building churches!" The advice was never acted upon, but did little to build confidence in the new district superintendent.

⁵⁴Ted W. Engstrom and R. Alec MacKenzie, Managing Your Time (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967), p. 157.

Chapter 2

PLANNING TO BUILD

In his initial meeting with the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee of the United Methodist Church of Valencia Heaton indicated that he would support a policy of increasing membership, developing program, and not building a church facility for at least two years. This direction met with strong approval by the congregation. At that time Raymond V. Greenlee was serving every Sunday as liturgist, as well as assistant lay leader, chairman of the Committee on Membership and Evangelism, chairman of the Committee on Stewardship, and along with his wife, Ginny, had reorganized the church school and offered to sponsor the youth fellowship on Sunday evenings. Greenlee quipped, "With the level of giving of our members it will take at least one thousand of them to get started on a building program."

First Sixty Days

At the age of 34 Greenlee was West Coast auditor of the Prudential Life Insurance Company of America, president of Old Orchard Home Owners' Association, coach of a little league football team, leader in Indian Guides and well known to the whole community. In 1969 the Junior Chamber of Commerce in New Jersey elected him "Outstanding Young Man of the Year in the State." Forty-nine days after

Heaton's arrival in Valencia Liturgist Greenlee collapsed at the lecturn in the chancel following the processional hymn, "Praise, My Soul, the King of Heaven." Four days later he was pronounced dead at Memorial Hospital in Culver City.

In lieu of flowers his widow requested that donations be given to the United Methodist Church of Valencia building fund, and money came from all over the country. From Prudential's head office in New Jersey, from Greenlee's college in Connecticut, and his high school colleagues in Illinois. Within one year almost one hundred new members joined the United Methodist Church of Valencia. Most of them had been friends of Greenlee.¹ At the time of his death Greenlee had been heading up a pledge campaign with Orren Harris. The small parish was divided in groups of ten and twelve. Dinners were served almost every evening in someone's home so that the new pastor and spouse, chairman of the Finance Committee and chairman of the Stewardship Committee were able to meet and tell the story of the church's need to the entire congregation. Many people tripled their pledges. Oral Roberts' book, Seed Faith, was distributed to all who attended the dinners. A money back guarantee was offered to all who increased their pledges: if at the end of the year they were not better off financially and spiritually than they had been at the

¹See Appendix A, Raymond V. Greenlee Memorial Service.

²Oral Roberts, Miracle of Seed-Faith (Tulsa: Oral Roberts, 1970).

time they made their pledges, they could have their money back. At the year's end no one claimed a refund and church income had almost tripled.

"The most capable is the one who is at the right place at the right time and who is judged by those who admire his strengths and are not affected by, nor ignorant of, his weaknesses."³

So wrote Engstrom and MacKenzie, and so believed Heaton in January of 1973. A Charge Conference was convened and a building committee was elected with the instructions to meet every week until the planning was done for the first unit of the United Methodist Church of Valencia. Little did the Charge Conference of January, 1973 realize that nearly one hundred and fifty meetings would be held before completion of the building in 1975.

Following the Charge Conference Hinshaw met with Heaton and challenged him to produce a membership of 200 and raise \$15,000 in cash. If these conditions could be met Hinshaw assured Heaton that he would obtain funding for the construction of the first unit. Also, he reminded him of the Conference mortgage on the building site in the amount of approximately \$56,000, due and payable upon the payment in full of the mortgage on the first unit. In the meantime it would bear interest for the Conference at the rate of one per cent per annum. In view of this Conference

³Ted W. Engstrom and R. Alec MacKenzie, Managing Your Time (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967), p. 193.

rule in regard to construction of new churches Hinshaw counseled Heaton to "go for as large a building as is possible to build at this time."⁴ since the Conference would be sure to apply fully its rules as they related to new churches.

On moving into his office in Valencia the new pastor sought in vain for records of meetings. The Charge Conference reports were intact. One Council of Ministries' meeting record existed. There were no minutes of any committee meetings apart from the above, yet there were architect's sketches and verbal recollections of meetings. A few copies of letters between pastors, conference officials, and land developers were extant from the first year of the church. Brossmer had left virtually no record of his correspondence with Scharer, Hildebrand, Hinshaw or Williams. In view of this dirth of history of the church, Heaton determined to collect a file of facts that others could build upon should he not survive to see the completion of his dream, the erection of a new church.

Monthly letters reporting attendance, membership and finances were systematically sent to Hinshaw, Hildebrand and Williams. Letters received from any of the foregoing were duplicated and shared with the chairman of the building committee and read to the committee. Perhaps such an undertaking to guarantee accurate communications resulted

⁴Personal conversation between Kenneth G. Heaton and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, January, 1973 in the Valencia parsonage.

in an "over-kill". Williams' successor, Kirkman, complained to the Valencia building committee that the file on the Valencia church was the thickest of any in the Conference office. This should validate the claim that every conceivable effort was made to avoid a breakdown in communications by Valencia's third pastor. He repeatedly followed up telephone calls with letters, clarifying his understanding of communications.

Monthly newsletters included lengthy reports of the progress of the building committee, and they were mailed to the above four named Conference officials as well as every member of the District Board of Building and Location. In addition no letters left the pastor's office unless they were copied for filing in the church office. The merit of such meticulous copying was best illustrated when the bishop as well as the district superintendent denied receiving invitations to participate in the service of consecration three months after they had been mailed. Eventually their respective secretaries were able to locate the original invitations after the pastor sent them copies of the originals. Years of experience in the church, coupled with an accountant's training, and a natural inclination to file everything that crossed his desk, gives insight into why the third pastor of the Valencia church chose to write a doctoral dissertation on the basis of the records he had accumulated. His over-reaction to what he viewed as the negligence of the past may perhaps be viewed

by some as pompous pietism bordering on a claim of perfection of deeds during the planning and construction of the church. Such was not his intention, but if it be conclusion of his critics he is content to live with their judgement.

In addition to insisting on the keeping of minutes by committee secretaries, the pastor wrote his own record of every meeting he attended. During the course of construction he used a ruled notebook to log daily progress on the building. When disputes arose with the builder, this notebook proved to be an indispensable tool. On one occasion it satisfied a traffic court that the pastor had not been parked in a no-parking-area near the Los Angeles International Airport for which a police officer had mistakenly ticketed him.

With determination to document well and communicate clearly the pastor recommended to the nominating committee that it present names to the Annual Charge Conference for the election of a building committee.

Building Committee Organization

Though the church was young in years the members were not all of youthful spirit; factional interests had already begun to appear. Fearful lest party spirit should jeopardize the building committee progress, and aware of one man's threats to quit if another were elected chairman, Heaton himself chaired meetings, as well as having temporary

chairpersons selected for a week at a time. For six months no permanent chairperson was elected. The person who had been the most vocal in private with the pastor regarding his own desire to serve as chairman, began missing meetings. Eventually the committee began individually to silently question this man's commitment to the task at hand. By absenting himself from meetings he disqualified himself from the chairmanship, and Donald H. Cravener, Jr. was elected. A mature executive, he had served as vice-president of a large manufacturing concern and was also a member of the National Board of Examiners for Manufacturing Engineers. About the same time Kenneth Shaw, a Lockheed engineer was elected secretary. Other members of the committee were equally as well qualified.

Other members included the following:⁵ Richard Bruce superintendent of new construction for the Mobile Oil Company in Southern California; Ginny Greenlee, widow of Raymond V. Greenlee, Lester L. Hiebert, retired superintendent of schools, who had supervised the construction of over \$50,000,000 worth of public schools in Kern, Los Angeles, and Riverside counties; David Mastroleo, superintendent of the Hillcrest Country Club in Los Angeles; Orren Harris, an architect, William Hitchcock, an executive with the Federal Housing Authority; Robert Ritchie, national treasurer of an

⁵Minutes, Charge Conference, January 24, 1973, United Methodist Church of Valencia.

oil corporation; Lorraine Gidel, president of the United Methodist Women of Valencia and a homemaker; Robert Hart, a Lockheed engineer; Duane Leathers, a Lockheed engineer; and Gertrude White, a retired school teacher and church school superintendent.

Shortly some of the less optimistic members of the committee began dropping out of meetings. Building costs, inflation, and financing posed a threat to these people. Those who stayed active in the committee tended to be persons who looked for opportunities amid problems. Hinshaw frequently made pastoral calls on the pastor and the building committee. He often said, "There are no real problems, but just opportunities." He reflected an observation of Peter Drucker, the famous authority on business management.

In speaking of General Motors, Edison, and the Rothchilds of banking fame in Europe, Drucker wrote that

all three . . . have one thing in common: they build on strength; they look for opportunities rather than for problems; they stress attainable results rather than dangers to be avoided. In fact they are complimentary. Each serves a distinct function and purpose. Together they convert the insight of analysis into a program for effective action.⁶

Solutions to problems began to emerge, and a program for effective action began to appear. It is questionable now three years later whether the Valencia building program could

⁶Peter F. Drucker, Managing for Results (London: Pan Books, 1964), p. 163.

have gotten off the ground without the optimistic support, frequently in person, given by Lawrence Hinshaw, district superintendent. His presence validated his promises. With the realization that America was in one of its worst ever periods of inflation the building committee worked feverishly to develop a building program while interviewing architects.

Much talent existed among new members, and as a result three were elected to serve for those who resigned. These were: Travis Fetterolf, a project manager for Lockheed, Stephen Broadwater, a vice-president of a construction loan corporation, and Dallas Jones, manager of the General Motors proving grounds for the west coast.

Program for the Architect

Concepts for building began to emerge for construction of the first unit of the new church. Each member of the building committee drafted his own design of what he or she envisioned as the needs of the congregation. The congregation was surveyed by means of a questionnaire to determine its desire for a multi-purpose building as opposed to a traditional chapel with fixed seating.⁷ Finally the building committee adopted a formal program for construction. Some basic considerations follow.

It was recognized that the typical Valencia family would give one hour per week to worship. Consequently space was needed for church school to function at the same time as

⁷See Appendix B, Congregational Questionnaire.

worship. At that time the average worship service attendance was about eighty as was the church school attendance. It was projected that space would be needed for about two times as many people as were then attending church. Further, it was determined that the average worship service attendance in United Methodist Churches on the Santa Barbara district was 152.⁸ National statistics suggested that fifty percent of the United Methodist churches in America had an average attendance of 150.⁹ Finally the District Board of Building and Location concurred that 150 was a reasonable number of seats for worship for a new congregation.¹⁰ Computing needed space for Christian education, offices, storage, restrooms, kitchen, narthex, and chancel, the committee determined that a minimum of 5690 square feet was needed; to be safe 6,000 square feet made better sense. With these facts on paper¹¹ the building committee felt the time had come to engage an architect.

Five architects were interviewed whose fees varied from four per cent to twelve per cent of the total cost of

⁸Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1972), p. 556.

⁹Lyle E. Schaller, "You're in Top 20 Percent with 150 Regulars at Worship, Christian Advocate, xvii February 15, 1973), 16-17.

¹⁰Santa Barbara District Board of Building and Location, meeting at Valencia, California, May 7, 1973.

¹¹See Appendix C Considerations for Building.

the completed facility. Each was considered on the merits of what he had built. The original architect, Robert Ricciardi, engaged by David Taylor, the first pastor of the church, appeared to have a flair for design superior to the rest, and since he had already been paid \$2,000 for preliminary design, he offered to have the initial payment applied against his total fee for planning a church. He was selected with the understanding that he would have final plans ready for bidders within 60 days.¹² At the end of 60 days he returned to the building committee with a plan of a Presbyterian Church he had already built. One hundred and eighty more days elapsed before the final plans for what became the United Methodist Church of Valencia were finally ready for Los Angeles County plan check.

Owner-builder Construction Plan

At that time two nearby United Methodist Churches were being built -- the Friendly Valley United Methodist Church of Newhall where Eugene Elmore was pastor and the Camarillo United Methodist Church, served by Richard Brooks, chairman of the District Board of Building and Location. Both churches were serving as their own general contractors; that is, their pastors acted in the capacity of general contractors. This concept seemed workable for the Valencia Church in view of the experience of the committee members.

¹²Building Committee Meeting Minutes, May 22, 1973.

Such a plan would save money, many thousands of dollars. Therefore, the building superintendent of the Friendly Valley church construction, Ed Price of Pomona, was invited to several committee meetings with the understanding that he would serve as superintendent of construction. The committee agreed to pay him \$10.80 per hour total for all his efforts during the course of construction. Further he would work with the architect in developing as many cost savings as possible. Unfortunately there is no record of either man making any attempt to communicate with the other.

The owner-builder concept did not meet with approval for financing with the Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church national office in New York City. Apparently they had had bad experiences with such arrangements and would loan money for construction only to churches employing bonded general contractors. This policy of the national board cost the United Methodist Church of Valencia \$65,000. When asked to present a competitive bid Price raised his cost estimate from \$150,000 to \$215,000. Burton Michaelson, who eventually built the church, was the lowest bidder with a contract for \$214,900 for a complete building. Price was eventually paid \$520 consultant's fees and dismissed.

Conference Policy Regarding Church Construction

Conference personnel made frequent reference to Conference policy regarding construction of new churches,

but the pastor and his building committee were hard put to find the written source of policy. Persual of old annual Conference journals gave the most information, but even that was scant. The insight of Chester I. Barnard would have been welcomed by the Valencia pastor had he read it in 1973: ". . . in fact, successful cooperation in or by formal organizations is abnormal, not the normal, condition."¹³ When the pastor sought for a manual on new church construction he was referred to the Board of Global Ministries in New York City. From that office he received several brochures and booklets. Both he and the building committee read them in their entirety. These included "A Building Program Checklist," "District Board of Building and Location Checklist," "Steps in New Church Development," and "National Division of the Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church Office of Architecture." These brochures amounted to one hundred and eleven pages of reading. In addition four other booklets were read: "Preliminary Planning," "Sanctuary Planning," "Fellowship Hall Planning." and "Church School Planning." None of these readings revealed that a United Methodist Church could not serve as its own general contractor and obtain a loan from the national loan office of the general church, but this verbal policy was stated by Darwin Andrus, general

¹³Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), p.5.

church loan officer, after many months of planning in that direction by the Valencia building committee. This was not the only revelation to be made by Andrus.

After a six hour "flying trip" from Valencia to Palm Desert, California to get architectural plans for Andrus to take back to New York for the national division's architect to review, Heaton was shocked to learn that no architect was employed by the national division. Andrus looked at the plans for less than sixty seconds, and said he guessed they looked OK! The stated policy of the church indicated that Jerry Ellis, A.I.A., executive secretary, Department of Architecture, New York, New York, reviewed and approved all projects receiving national division funding.¹⁴ In their book on management Engstrom and MacKenzie have an excellent suggestion: "Let people know where they stand."¹⁵ Heaton began to wonder whether anyone really knew where he stood or what the church had to offer by way of policy. His confusion was sensed by the building committee. Out of this anxiety eventually shared by the committee arose a determination to excel in planning and thereby win the approval of the Conference for whatever the local church wanted. Douglas McGregor has spoken to the issue in his

¹⁴Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1973), p. 303.

¹⁵Engstrom and MacKenzie, p. 137.

treatment of "Rewards and Punishments as Incentives."

It is interesting and significant . . . that under circumstances people will often . . . involve a kind of sabotage of management's control systems. "Beating the system" is a widely played game in which intrinsic rewards are highly motivational.¹⁶

The Valencia building committee was composed of people who knew well the business world and how to sell ideas and merchandise. Repeatedly when they acted in good faith they discovered that they were betrayed because they did not know "this rule or that rule."

The climax of their frustration came when the District Board of Building and Location met with them and advised that they could ill afford to build a \$65,000 church according to Conference guidelines. Following that meeting¹⁷ the planning and efficiency experts of Lockheed, McDonnell Douglas, Mobil Oil and others, all members of the building committee of the United Methodist Church of Valencia, began the development of PERT¹⁸ charts on membership, finances, construction costs and construction time frames. In retrospect it appeared they were aware of the opening lines of the 1972 Board of Missions and Church Extension report to Annual Conference, but they were not;

¹⁶Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 8.

¹⁷May 7, 1973.

¹⁸Program Evaluation and Review Techniques.

these lines read:

These are critical years, both for the church and for humankind. A leading industrialist and churchman has said the crisis of our time has all the characteristics of a Greek drama where the actors, powerless to affect the events that sweep them along, play out their parts that can only end in tragedy.¹⁹

Pragmaticians, the business managers of the building committee, had read Drucker's lines:

Results are obtained by exploiting opportunities, not by solving problems. . . . There is . . . need for constant reappraisal and redirection; and the need is greatest where it is least expected. . . . Yet it is dangerously tempting to keep on patching yesterdays garment rather than work on designing tomorrow's pattern.²⁰

These men sensed that the liberal politics of the 1960's had failed and that a new conservatism had settled in. They had witnessed the failure of "the children's crusade into politics" in 1968. In their analysis the Church was still being buoyed on by the problems of the sixties, and emphasis on these problems would not float the funding necessary for church extension in the seventies. Valencia was a new model city, founded in 1969, to which urbanities could escape from racial and class conflicts; its values were the old, conservative concepts of the white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants. Though their kind made up 95.8% of United Methodism, there

¹⁹Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1972), p. 237.

²⁰Drucker, p. 18

were times when they felt like the forgotten people of the Church. The conference had other concerns.

Conference Plans for Missions

The 1967 Board of Missions and Church Extension report to Annual Conference predicted that "the influx of new people . . . has not changed . . . ,"²¹ but "we shall build fewer churches."²² In the next three years Conference church extension allocations dropped from \$675,000 to \$260,000, and church extension properties were sold in at least three locations.²³ Urban, ethnic ministries became the focus of the Conference Board of Missions. By 1975 the Annual Conference had reduced its allotment of funds for new churches to \$165,000 with which to purchase property and give "a donation toward building of first units for at least two churches."²⁴ It is questionable whether land alone could be acquired for one church with such limited funding. A further indication of the Conference's lack of commitment to the task of establishing new churches is seen in the near absence of rules relating to church construction in the 1975 Conference Journal. Through to 1974 at least

²¹Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1967), p. 209.

²²*Ibid.*

²³*Ibid.* (1970), p. 231.

²⁴*Ibid.* (1975), p. 206.

four pages of rules were printed in the report of the Board of Missions and Church Extension; however, in 1975 there appeared one short paragraph of guidance on church construction.²⁵ The Conference was retreating further and further from facing the challenge of new church construction.

By 1976 the possibility of new church construction was no longer viewed as a mission, but as a gamble

. . . according to Fred Coots, Superintendent of the Santa Ana District, one of the fastest growing areas in the country.

Orange County continues to grow, but financial realities have made it necessary to seek alternate forms of church growth. Coots says that any new church development represents "a \$500,000 gamble" on the part of the superintendent and the Board of Church Extension. . . .

No new Anglo churches have been initiated within the past three years. No land has been purchased. No buildings have been erected. Yet in this period three new congregations have been formed.

. . . At Norwalk . . . Iglesia de Christo, a Spanish speaking congregation which shares Christ Church facilities. . . .

In Garden Grove . . . a Korean congregation . . . shares facilities with First United Methodist Church. . . .

The Orange County Japanese Ministries . . . is worshipping weekly at Fountain Valley United Methodist Church. . . .²⁶

It should be noted that Coots was dean of the Cabinet in 1976. Church membership loss on the Santa Ana District

²⁵Cf. Ibid., (1975), p. 287, with (1974), pp. 333-36.

²⁶"New Models for Church Extension," Circuit West (January 2, 1976), 1.

between 1973 and 1975 was in excess of ten percent (3,551 members).²⁷

Since the 1967 Conference stated decision to "build fewer churches" membership declined from 262,543 to 211,121 or about twenty percent, and the number of preaching places dropped from 493 to 478, a decrease of 15. The loss in membership between 1967 and 1975 represents a number equal to the total Conference membership at the outbreak of World War I (51,337) when the Conference reported 278 churches and 330 ministers. Projected on the 1916 ratio of ministers to church members, the Conference should have 1,353 ministers in 1976 instead of the 922 reported. During the Depression years (1929 - 1939) church membership increased in the Conference by 433 while the number of churches declined by only five. It is possible that 1975 church membership losses reflect a deeper problem than economic recession.²⁸ The stance of the annual Conference toward building mission churches is reflected in the attitude of the national board.

Church Extension in the National Division

In 1975 a young pastor in Texas was appointed to a new community to establish a new church. He wrote to the

²⁷Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1974, 1975)

²⁸Ibid., (1975), pp. 269-271

New York Church Development Office of the United Methodist Church in New York for guidance which advised him that the office "was shut down when its director resigned two years ago. There is no office in the church handling such matters."²⁹ A United Methodist Reporter editorial charged that

there . . . can be little doubt that United Methodists have not always done the best possible job of dealing with new congregation development. This was evident in the mad building days of the 50's and 60's. . . . This is also evident in 1975 when a 10 million member denomination which seems to have a national agency in charge of nearly every other conceivable church-related matter, has no office and not even one staff member dealing full time with new church development.³⁰

The conviction that denominational leadership was disinterested in new church construction was not restricted to an isolated pastor in Texas and another in California in 1975.

Church extension in the United Methodist Church is a "sick joke," according to the former director of a fund established to loan money for new church buildings across the nation.

The Rev. Paul H. Smith, who resigned June 15 after nearly ten years as director of the United Methodist Development Fund (UMDF), has told TM/UMR that "church extension has suffered such a de-emphasis in recent years that it stands ready to collapse as a function of our denomination."³¹

²⁹"Pastor Starting New Church Doesn't Find Any Answers," United Methodist Reporter (Dallas, August 8, 1975), 3. One of the most useful resources available to the United Methodist Church of Valencia was William Ward Watkins, Planning and Building the Modern Church (New York: Dodge, 1951)

³⁰"New Church Development Needs to Be a 'Full Time' Job of UMC," United Methodist Reporter (Dallas, August 8, 1975), 2.

³¹"We Can't Go On Like This -- It's a Sick Joke, Claim Two Former Officials," United Methodist Reporter (Dallas, August 8, 1975), 3.

Darwin Andrus resigned as field representative in the church extension office the same day as Paul H. Smith.

Andrus charged that

church extension is tied very closely to evangelism and, like evangelism, has been "almost totally overshadowed in recent years by the church's emphasis on sociological issues." He claims that the National Division is willing to spend large sums of money studying sociological issues, but "closes the purse" on evangelism.³²

Smith indicated that church extension funds had declined sixty per cent since 1967 in the national division, and Andrus concluded that he saw

"no future for church extension or new church development in the National Division. . . . If we don't get it out of there we are going to lose it altogether,"³³ he said.

Fortunately for the morale of the minister in Valencia and for his building committee the foregoing reflections of the national division's dilemma were not published until after their church was completed, but nonetheless they sensed the vibrations of these frustrations. Concern was expressed lest national division funds were not available. Alternate courses of action were considered.

Alternatives Considered by the Building Committee

Long range and short range planning in industry were the day-to-day tasks of most of the members of the

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid.

building committee. Realizing that alternate concepts had to be developed lest the central thrust of the building committee be aborted, the committee turned to the possibility of purchasing any acceptable, existing structure. Portable classrooms were considered since the local College of the Canyons in Valencia was erecting permanent classrooms. Cost prohibited consideration of these portables.

Local banks were contacted regarding rates of interest and levels of loans they might be willing to extend to the church. Typically they would be willing to loan fifty per cent of the total value at nine and one-half per cent interest.

St. Stephens Episcopal Church in Valencia, without a vicar from September, 1973 until February of 1975 averaged twenty and twenty-five people in attendance at worship. Heaton filled the Episcopal pulpit as well as the Methodist on several occasions. In view of these conditions the building committee considered an outright purchase of St. Stephen's which had cost \$315,000 in 1968. The District Board of Building and Location, met in Valencia, viewed St. Stephen's Episcopal Church buildings and land, and concurred in the building committee's estimate that \$160,000 would be a bargain.³⁴

In seeking to work through the proper channels, the building committee asked the district superintendent to

³⁴March 5, 1973.

approach the Episcopal bishop with the offer. The bishop planned to retire shortly. His assistant was seeking a pastoral appointment as an economy move for the diocese. Heaton approached Hildebrand to open negotiations with the Episcopalians. When after some months of waiting, no word was heard from either Hinshaw, Hildebrand or the Episcopalians, Cravener, chairman of the building committee spoke with the newly installed Episcopal bishop, Bishop Rusack. Rusack indicated that if such losses were to be sustained, "the Episcopalians would keep the losses within the family, and he would appoint an effective vicar to Valencia and get the mission on its feet."³⁵ At this juncture it became apparent that the only way to house the Methodist congregation was to build a new facility.

Father Minter, who had served the Episcopal Church until his resignation in September, 1973, frequently referred to the need of a "proper church." What he meant was a church with pews, carpet, and permanent chancel. St. Stephen's had blue and orange, plastic chairs, a concrete floor, and a moveable chancel. The words "proper church" became a battle cry of the Valencia Methodists. The Conference and the National Board of Global Ministries had well-entrenched notions that a new first unit of any church in any community must be totally multi-purpose. When it became known to

³⁵Personal conversation between Kenneth G. Heaton and Donald H. Cravener, Jr.

Hildebrand that the Valencia people wanted a "proper church," he suggested a compromise -- cathedral chairs. Such chairs would have cost more than upholstered pews. Caught between congregation and Conference Heaton frequently had to question his own Christian ethics: were they the ethics of the Christian Church or the American business world? Frequently building committee members raised the question of ethics.

The local congregation had voted three to one for pews.³⁶ Hinshaw, Hildebrand, and Andrus insisted on chairs. The congregation wanted carpet. The Conference wanted tile. The people wanted a permanent, stone chancel, but church policy makers would have made even the chancel portable. Decisions had to be made, but "arbitrary decision without cooperation tends to invite dispute."³⁷ Who should make the decisions -- the people, who would have to live with and ultimately pay for the building? Or the executives who would provide funding with approval of proper committees and boards and then move on to other appointments or retirement? On paper this may appear to be an easy

³⁶See Appendix B. Hildebrand offered a compromise -- cathedral chairs. Watkin, op. cit., pp. 147-148, warns that "the disadvantage of the individual is that it requires a larger amount of seating area within the church to accomodate the same number of members. . . . This inconvenience as well as the added cost of the furniture itself and of the space required for it, has prevented the chair from coming into wide or universal use." Herein Watkin is speaking of the cathedral chair.

³⁷Watkins, p. 142.

decision. For the pastor logic ran something like this: do as you are told by Conference officials because eventually you will need their cooperation or references for an appointment for yourself. But the deeper question, as the minister saw it, was what is right for this congregation at this point in time?

The Question of Ethics

A Shakespearean soliloquy would be in order to describe the "dark night of the soul" endured by the pastor to arrive at a decision on this question. New to the Conference and anxious for his future, he was aware of many new churches that were floundering and failing in which multipurpose buildings had been built following all the rules and guidelines of the Conference and national board. During this time he did some research on the career of Hildebrand by reading old Conference Journals and listening with admiration to accounts of Hildebrand's own success at Arcadia, California, where he had led the congregation in building a "proper Gothic chapel" for a first unit. The church had grown at the rate of 100 new members, net increase per year, for the first twelve years of its existence. Heaton's rationale ran something like this: two ministers preceding me have failed to build anything. The Valencia community is filled with multipurpose facilities that may be rented (from St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, to schools, to the homeowners' club houses to be found in every

subdivision of the area). There is no modern, middle-of-the-road Protestant church in the valley with carpeting, pews, the appointments of a "proper church," which is in keeping with the motifs of Valencia's early California architecture. Typically the people of Valencia live in \$50,000 to \$60,000 homes at a time when the average American family lives in a \$30,000 home. The people of this new area will be willing to pay for an attractive church building that is tastefully constructed in keeping with the character of the rest of the community, but one more multipurpose church will be doomed to the slow death of so many similar churches in other communities of which the District Board of Building and Location despairs.³⁸

The 1970, revised edition of United Methodist Altars gave guidance to the Valencia building committee by suggesting that the church should provide "a shared ministry of Word and Sacrament in an environment of spiritual intimacy. That says just about everything."³⁹

The above line of reasoning had been apparent to Heaton from the day of his arrival in Valencia, but he had failed to fully articulate his concepts for fear of censure. Eventually he spoke his piece, but it required lengthy

³⁸ Wesley Church, Woodland Hills, California is one church which immediately comes to mind.

³⁹ Dessie Ash Arnett and Lenace Robinette Clark, United Methodist Altars, (Charleston: Jarrett, 1970) p. 26.

reflection on his personal ethics and his career planning. Douglas McGregor had an uncanny insight into human nature, and his analysis reflected the thinking of Heaton at the time he elected to break out of the mold of a tradition with which he could no longer live.

. . . It would not, in any sense, be an exaggeration to assert that any large organization would come to a grinding halt within a month if all its members began behaving strictly in accordance with the structure of responsibility and authority defined by the formal organization chart, the position charts, and the formal controls.⁴⁰

What McGregor wrote to managers Fletcher has articulated for twentieth century Christians:

Faced with the web of duties in our social existence, confronted by many neighbors, love is compelled to be calculating. Even Paul Ramsey was finally forced . . . to confess that love is, so to speak, compelled to "figure the angels". . . . This is the operational or situational discipline of the love ethic -- finding absolute love's relative course.⁴¹

Indeed, how to perform the loving deed in every situation requires much calculation. To satisfy the Conference expectations as well as the concerns of the local congregation would have required changing either the Conference Rules or the people of Valencia's desires. The people of Valencia have an average residency of two and one half years. They would be gone before the Conference Rules could be changed. Further they had been waiting already for three years to get on with building a church.

⁴⁰McGregor, p. 36.

⁴¹Joseph Fletcher, Moral Responsibility (Philadelphia Westminster Press, 1967), p. 18.

With regard to changing Conference Rules it is worthwhile to consider the wisdom of the late James A. Pike. In the following he wrote with regard to the issue of open housing laws, but what he said may apply equally as well to Conference Rules.

When a law is evil, or emasculated of its former good, normally a serious attempt at the procuring of adequate legislative action should come before organized disobedience. But it could be argued that the application of such a "condition precedent" in this situation may be fatuous. . . . Delay in direct action in order to develop positive action toward a legislative -- and, behind that, a popular -- reversal would have little grounding in the likelihood of positive results.⁴²

As the pastor saw it, his responsibility was the establishment of a new church, not the rewriting of Conference Rules. With only one life to live he had time for only one assignment or the other but not both!

Courage was finally forged while reading Leroy Augenstein's Come, Let Us Play God, in which he wrote:

We have . . . to set up new decision-making apparatus and answer some profound questions which previously we have left to God. In recognizing this awesome responsibility, we dare not ever become arrogant or callous, for even though we have no choice but to play a superhuman kind of role, we can never be God. However, God has given us dominion over the earth. Since man's increasing knowledge now forces him to make decisions of life and death that cannot be sidestepped, come let us make them together -- humbly and prayerfully, but above all responsibly.⁴³

⁴²James A. Pike, You and the New Morality (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 128.

⁴³Leroy Augenstein, Come, Let Us Play God (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. ix.

Responsibly and lovingly emerged a course of action, but it required intestinal fortitude.

The District Board of Building and Location met with the building committee in Valencia on May 7, 1973 and again in September of the same year. At a second meeting Heaton announced that the Valencia United Methodists would either build a "proper church" or they would rent forever anyone of the number of multi-purpose buildings that existed in the community. One after another the members of the District Board began suggesting that they in no way meant to block the construction of the church; they simply wanted to advise. The people could now have their way -- with district approval, but the approval had been hard to come by.

The basic concept of planning had now been well established, but more urgent was the issue of financing before construction could begin. The matter of finance is presented in the next chapter after first summarizing this one on planning.

Summary

The sudden death of a popular member of the parish, Raymond V. Greenlee, gave incentive to the church to get on with plans for building. The building committee, organized with a cross section of very capable leaders in business and industry prepared a program for the architect which called for a traditional chapel with offices and educational space. To have known from the beginning that an owner-

builder concept of construction would not be allowed by the general church would have saved considerable time and money. Since 1967 the construction of new churches has declined in the value of priorities of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. In the interests of ecumenicity and economy the Valencia United Methodists considered and worked toward the purchase of the existing Episcopal Church in Valencia until it became clearly apparent that such a purchase was an impossibility. The next chapter will deal with financing for construction.

Chapter 3

FINANCING FOR CONSTRUCTION

Several sources of funding were considered from the beginning to finance the construction of a church in Valencia. According to Hildebrand, Taylor hoped to be able to make a very large donation from his oil investment firm;¹ it was with this hope in mind that he pursued the concept of a five hundred seat sanctuary. In addition to his personal contribution he sold oil stocks to several church members in the hopes of making them financially capable of giving large donations.² Unfortunately these sources of funding never materialized.

Brossmer came to Valencia from the First United Methodist Church of Torrance where he had served as youth minister, and his father-in-law was the senior pastor. As a result of this relationship the Torrance church gave \$5,000 for the building fund of the United Methodist Church of Valencia. For the construction of a first unit Brossmer projected a cost of \$60,000 with a possible larger expenditure of \$80,000³ to be financed by Security Pacific

¹Personal conversation between Kenneth G. Heaton and Will Hildebrand.

²Personal conversation between Kenneth G. Heaton and Donald H. Cravener, Jr.

³Council on Ministries Minutes, United Methodist Church of Valencia, March 6, 1972.

Bank at 7 1/2% interest over a period of 25 years.⁴

Apparently the plan died for lack of enthusiastic support from either the Conference or the congregation. A further consideration put forth by Brossmer was the sale of the parsonage and construction of another parsonage on the church site.⁵ The present writer cannot conceive of the land developer, Newhall Land and Farming Company, permitting such a plan to materialize. Perhaps this is the reason it did not; however, consideration of selling the parsonage did not cease with the departure of Brossmer.

The Sale of the Parsonage

In his initial meeting with the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee Heaton indicated his desire to own his own home.⁶ Consequently it should have been apparent to all concerned that he would move in the direction of sale of the parsonage. Since he owned a home in Lancaster where he had previously lived he wished to dispose of it and acquire a home in Valencia. From the beginning the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee was receptive to the notion. Likewise the newly elected building committee acted quickly in accord with the pastor's desire to own his own home.

⁴Ibid. According to Conference Rules 15 years would be the maximum allowable repayment period.

⁵Personal conversation between Kenneth G. Heaton and Donald H. Cravener, Jr.

⁶See p. 19.

The whole issue of housing allowance versus the parsonage system has had strong emotional overtures in the annual Conference in recent years. There may be situations in which the minister would rather not purchase his own home (inner city or rural parishes stand out as the most likely), but these are not normally the locations where new churches are begun. If the parsonage system is the only workable scheme for the placement of United Methodist ministers, it would appear equitable that all ministers under episcopal appointment should live in furnished parsonages including pastors in educational, counseling, and administrative roles. In the past one hundred years in the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church more than one-third of all ministers have lived in other than parsonages. In 1975 44.8% of the ministers under episcopal appointment were living in parsonages.⁷

In April, 1973 Heaton reported to Hildebrand that a further thought . . . came to light in our building committee meeting this past week, . . . the possibility of selling the parsonage in which there should be close to \$20,000 in equity. . . . The building committee unanimously endorsed the idea of a . . . housing allowance, if the parsonage equity could be diverted to church construction costs. We realize that the building committee is not empowered to make such decisions. I would like to hear your opinion.⁸

⁷Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1975) pp. 268-271.

⁸Personal correspondence between Will Hildebrand and Kenneth G. Heaton, April 28, 1973.

A copy of the above was sent to District Superintendent Hinshaw, and George F. Williams, Conference treasurer.

Williams replied promptly on April 30 reporting that

When we purchased the property in 1969 we paid \$38,377.04. Of that the Conference Board of Missions has donated \$8,111.40, which would have to be returned to the Board if the property is sold and no other parsonage purchased.⁹

As a clarification of understanding it would appear that Williams was indicating that the Board of Missions had made an investment in the parsonage, not a donation. Be that as it may, he further added that

the Pasadena District Union . . . put \$401.64 into the purchase of the parsonage and I am not certain whether or not they would want that back. We presently have outstanding as of March 1, 1973, taxes and insurance which have been paid on the property of \$3,567. This too would have to be repaid from the proceeds of the sale.¹⁰

Hinshaw was less detailed in his verbal response, but much more explicit. He simply said, "It is easier to move ministers when we want to, if they don't own their own homes."¹¹ Hildebrand offered the possibility that the Annual Conference could forgive the church the debt and let the money invested in the parsonage by the Conference be used

⁹Personal correspondence between Kenneth G. Heaton and George F. Williams, April 30, 1973.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Personal conversation between Lawrence Hinshaw and Kenneth Heaton.

for construction costs.¹² Williams never deviated from his original position.

In December of 1973 when the local church assumed full responsibility for its support Williams reminded the church that

Conference Board of Missions has made payments of principal and interest between November 1, 1969 and December 31, 1973 totaling \$10,900.00. Principal, \$1,311.83, Interest \$9,588.15. In addition, the Board had paid \$4,566.00 on the impound account for Taxes and Insurance on the parsonage. This advance will be added to the loan which has been made for the church site by the Conference Board of Missions.¹³

Although the local church assumed full responsibility for the debt on the parsonage the title remained in the name of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Conference.

Eventually the sale of the parsonage came before the local board of trustees for action. For them the issue was long overdue.

Thus, they moved that

the trustees give unanimous support to the resolution that the Conference and local church support the minister in his preference as to home ownership or parsonage use.

. . . a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Conference committee studying this matter and to the district superintendent.¹⁴

This meeting took place on August 9, 1973. Interest rates were beginning to soar to 11 1/2%. Church members began

¹²Personal conversation between Will Hildebrand and Kenneth Heaton.

¹³Personal correspondence between George F. Williams and Kenneth Heaton, December 17, 1973, p. 2.

¹⁴Board of Trustees' Minutes, The United Methodist Church of Valencia, August 9, 1973.

debating the sale price of the parsonage. Consequently a great deal of time was taken to study the matter, and two years and two months elapsed before the transaction was completed.¹⁵ By November of 1974 George Williams was getting concerned for the proceeds from the parsonage to be deposited in the escrow account that he was handling for the construction of the church. Heaton advised him that

the trustees, the finance committee and the building committee have unanimously recommended the sale of the parsonage, and the matter is being referred to the pastor-parish relations committee with subsequent referral to a specially called Charge Conference. . . . The District Superintendent is being kept abreast of the proposal, and Richard Brooks, chairman of the District Board of Building and Location, has given verbal approval.¹⁶

On December 15, 1974 the District Board of Building and Location met at the parsonage in Valencia and

moved that the board approve the sale of the Valencia parsonage for not less than \$47,000 gross; and that an allowance of \$500 per month for a housing allowance be provided the pastor for the year of 1975; the amount of the allowance thereafter to be established in the budget of the church.¹⁷

Finally on December 29, 1974 a duly called Charge Conference convened and

Donald H. Cravener, Jr., chairman of the Administrative Board, moved that the parsonage be sold to Rev. Heaton according to the terms set forth by the District Board of Building and Location. Hiebert, lay leader,

¹⁵ See the section in Appendix E regarding the study made of the parsonage system.

¹⁶ Personal correspondence between Kenneth G. Heaton and George F. Williams, November 21, 1974.

¹⁷ Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference, The United Methodist Church, Santa Barbara District Board of Building and Location (Southern Section), Minutes, December 15, 1974.

seconded the motion. Members of the church present and voting, voted¹⁸ unanimously to sell the parsonage to Rev. Heaton.

\$16,795.12 was realized from the sale of the property.¹⁹

By this time, October 24, 1975, Hildebrand had retired. Williams had assumed responsibilities in the Board of Global Ministries in New York City, and no one questioned using the \$16,795.12 for construction costs for the new church, nor the repayment of the Conference for this amount. However, Galvan did indicate that the church would not be eligible to receive funds for a downpayment on a parsonage at any time in the future.²⁰

The pastor of the Valencia church signed the escrow papers, finalizing the purchase of the parsonage on October 15, 1975, three years to the day from the time he had arrived in Valencia. One wonders how many laymen would pursue the purchase of a home if it took that long to complete the transaction. The average homeowner in Valencia moves every two and one half years.

Chronologically the sale of the parsonage as a source of funds for construction was the first consideration of Heaton on moving to Valencia, and it was the last source to

¹⁸The United Methodist Church of Valencia, Charge Conference Minutes, December 29, 1974.

¹⁹Santa Clarita Valley Escrow Company Check Number 4331, October 24, 1975 (23926 Lyons Avenue, Newhall, California).

²⁰The United Methodist Church of Valencia, Board of Trustees' Minutes, December 10, 1975.

be realized. The second possible source of funds, a capital funds crusade, for \$15,000 has already been mentioned.²¹

The Capital Funds Crusades

Two capital funds crusades were conducted -- one according to design by the building committee, the other at the insistence of the Board of Global Ministries in New York. The first achieved its goal of \$15,000. The second resulted in pledges of \$2,400 in excess of the \$48,000 target. Per capita giving for the United Methodist Church of Valencia rose from the 1972 average of \$115 to \$161 in 1973, which was more than two times the national average for Methodists.²²

Hinshaw had challenged the church through its pastor to raise \$15,000 before beginning construction. Hildebrand had increased his offer from matching funds to double matching funds; that is, for every dollar the church raised he would secure a donation of two from the Conference. The building committee took over an August worship service and secured pledges of nearly \$5,000 in one service. By mid-September over \$10,000 was pledged. On November 2 1973 the

²¹See Chapter 2, First Sixty Days

²²Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches
(Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973), p. 243.

building fund treasurer reported pledges of \$12,000, donated by "little more than 50% of the members."²³ By the following May the goal was reached and another campaign begun because this was one of the stipulations for obtaining a loan from the national Board of Global Ministries.²⁴ The intent was to guarantee repayment of the mortgage for the first three years. The sale of the parsonage, the capital funds crusades, national division, Board of Global Ministries' mortgages, and Conference "donations"²⁵ were the sources of funding for construction of the church.

Mortgages

The first direct contact with New York regarding a mortgage was a telephone call on March 2, 1973 to John C. Gould, Office of Architecture, Board of Missions of the United Methodist Church. Gould followed up the conversation with a letter which in part suggested that the church

should contact Darwin Andrus of our Office of Church Extension. He is in charge of giving financial consultation and aid in your area. We're sure that

²³United Methodist Church of Valencia, Letter to the members, November 2, 1973, by Charles Bruhn, building fund treasurer.

²⁴Conversation between Darwin Andrus, Will Hildebrand and Kenneth G. Heaton, September 28, 1973 at 5250 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.

²⁵Conference donations often mean a mortgage that may be collected at some future date. See p. 55.

he would be happy to work with your congregation in setting up a building program that is financially sound.²⁶

Contact was made and Andrus visited Valencia on September 26, 1973, and Heaton expressed appreciation to Andrus.

The District Board of Building and Location²⁷ has approved our plans for building and financing (We will need to borrow \$145,000). We have given our architect approval to proceed with working prelims, which will become the working drawings once we approve them. He expects to have this done within three weeks. Our trustees will meet within a week to process the loan application which you left with me.²⁸

The loan application was signed by the Valencia trustees on November 11 and forwarded to the district superintendent for his approval, so that it would be sure to be in New York in time for the January meeting of the national board, but apparently the application was not expedited.

On December 17 Heaton received a letter from Andrus indicating that the loan application had arrived too late to be acted upon in the January meeting. Incensed, Cravener, chairman of the building committee, wrote to Andrus, and the following is part of what he said.

²⁶Personal correspondence between John C. Gould and Kenneth G. Heaton, March 2, 1973.

²⁷October 4, 1973.

²⁸Personal correspondence between Kenneth G. Heaton and Darwin Andrus, October 19, 1973.

We apparently were laboring under the erroneous impression that we had submitted in time to the Conference, and that you were aware of the activities in this respect.²⁹

Your statement that you will attempt to get the application on the April agenda but are uncertain as to the success of your actions, implies that something over four months prior notification is required. It is regrettable that this long term requirement was not made known. What appears from our viewpoint to be an almost capricious action, may very well prove to be the demise of our church as we know it.

. . . It is questionable just how many artistic evasions of responsibility the congregation can survive.³⁰

Heaton also made time to correspond with Andrus to whom he wrote that

a six month delay will create a 30 - 50% increase in construction costs. . . .

On reading your letter in a building committee meeting one of the mildest tempered gentlemen in the church quipped, "Oh the hell with them and their fund raiser! When they can show us they have money to loan, we will consider engaging their fund raiser!"³¹

It was obvious to the pastor that his executive officer in New York did not realize the urgency of the situation in Valencia, and so he gave some history of the church.

²⁹Heaton had made a trip from Valencia to Palm Desert on September 27 to get the preliminary plans for Andrus to view. In addition he had gone to Pomona to get a written bid from general contractor, Price, and delivered the bid and plans to Andrus at Hildebrand's office. Apparently Andrus had forgotten these efforts to meet his deadlines.

³⁰Correspondence between Darwin Andrus and Donald H. Cravener, Jr., January 3, 1974.

³¹Personal correspondence between Kenneth G. Heaton and Darwin Andrus, January 3, 1974, p. 1.

The typical laymen of this church has been a Methodist for sixteen years, he came from a thousand member or larger church, he lives in a \$50-\$60,000 home and earns \$20-\$30,000 a year; he has previously been through two church building programs in other communities, and has "just about had his fill of church building programs." Three times he has been promised a new church, and three times the promise has been denied him. He is a man of action, and he will "worship elsewhere for the sake of his children, where there are adequate facilities."³²

In addition to history of the church Heaton felt compelled to recite some of the history of his relationship with deadlines as he had understood them.

With regard to deadlines I should like to state that I am not responsible for our loan application being late for your January 12 meeting; however, it would appear at least on the surface that an application in your office by December 17 should be able to be copied and read by January 12, even taking into account Christmas vacation. You may recall my efforts last September while you were in California to ready our application for your November meeting -- I spent ten hours on the freeway in one day³³

The "painful letter,"³⁴ to borrow an expression from Saint Paul, bore fruit, and Andrus replied on January 9, 1974 that he had

succeeded in clearing the way to present your application to our Committee on Church Extension and to the Directors of the United Methodist Development Fund as a special urgent situation.³⁵

³²Ibid., p. 2.

³³Ibid.

³⁴See I Corinthians 5:9 and II Corinthians 6:14 - 7:1, as well as Clarence Tucker Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthian: Introduction, in The Interpreters Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), x 6.

³⁵Personal correspondence between Darwin Andrus and Kenneth Heaton, January 9, 1974.

These words came as a pleasant surprise, but this was not the only surprise. Hildebrand had taken the liberty of reducing the request for loan from \$145,000 to \$130,000. Andrus referred to this.

. . . Your loan application is in the sum of \$145,000; but your Conference Board of Global Ministries approved a loan in the sum of \$130,000; therefore, your application is being submitted for a total loan in the sum of \$130,000.³⁶

On January 17 Andrus wrote to Heaton with the good news that the application for a loan had been received favorably.³⁷

Conflicts in communication were still far from being resolved. In part Andrus' letter had said "When you are ready to proceed with the legal work, please let us know and our legal counsel will contact your attorney. . . ." The Valencia church had no attorney, so with the approval of the building committee, Heaton asked Dan Hon, J.D. of Newhall, California to act on behalf of the church. Three weeks later Andrus advised that

Normally, Mr. George F. Williams, your Conference Treasurer, serves as the escrow agent for most of our projects in the Southern California-Arizona Conference. It is quite possible that you should get in touch with him. . . .³⁸

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Personal correspondence between Darwin Andrus and Kenneth Heaton, January 17, 1974.

³⁸Personal correspondence between Darwin Andrus and Kenneth Keaton, dictated February 8, written February 14, 1974.

Verbally Williams had indicated to Heaton that the church should engage the services of an attorney, but when asked in the presence of Hildebrand about his willingness to serve as escrow agent he indicated to Heaton that normally he did serve as escrow agent and would be willing to so serve, and so he did.

On June 2 Hildebrand, Hinshaw and Heaton led the congregation in a groundbreaking ceremony. At Annual Conference two weeks later the Valencia church was presented to the session as being "under construction" in part of the report of the Board of Missions and Church Extension. A construction contract was signed with Burton Michaelson, General Contractor of Reseda on July 12, and construction was to begin within 10 days according to the contract. It was at this juncture that Williams decided that the building site would have to be transferred from the Board of Missions and Church Extension to the trustees of the local church.³⁹ Further, liens would have to be filed against the property to cover the "donations" the Conference had made. These were

A donation from the Conference Board of Missions on the land in the amount of \$52,315.13 and a donation from the Conference Board of Missions on the building of \$40,000,⁴⁰ or a total donation from the Conference of \$92,315.13.⁴¹

³⁹Telephone conversation between George F. Williams and Kenneth Heaton in July, 1974.

⁴⁰This figure includes the original \$10,000 given to the church for construction costs, but used to pay taxes on the land prior to the time the local church could begin thinking about building.

⁴¹Personal Correspondence between Kenneth Heaton and George Williams, July 26, 1974.

The lien was drawn up in "the form of Agreement Securing Repayment of Conditional Donation. . . ." ⁴² A mortgage, covering the loan of \$50,000 on the land, was also filed,

plus interest which was added to the loan and which accumulated from January, 1970 and not paid by the church total \$1,665.42. In addition there were taxes and insurance which we advanced for the church totaling \$4,566. . . . Added to the loan on the land equal \$56,231.42 which is enclosed, in the form of a note and secured by a Deed of Trust. ⁴³

Thus, the mission church in Valencia came to be encumbered with a debt of \$278,545.55 before beginning construction and learning what additional, unexpected costs might arise.

In terms of the psychology of human relationships as documented by Eric Berne in Games People Play the Valencia church could be said to be in position to play "Debtor," a game in which,

while the amateur seldom wins, he can at least enjoy himself. . . . By tradition played grimly, nothing is more disconcerting to the professionals than to have an amateur victim laugh at the outcome. In financial circles this is considered strictly Out. In cases reported to this writer, laughing at a debtor when one encounters him on the street is . . . , bewildering, frustrating and disconcerting. . . . ⁴⁴

But it is in this very game that the local church has found itself in relation to the Conference.

⁴²Ibid., p. 3.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Eric Berne, Games People Play (New York: Grove Press, 1964), p. 83.

Conference Donations

On July 31 Heaton met with Hildebrand to advise him that local church officers refused to sign the Agreement Securing Repayment of Conditional Donation of \$92,315.13 as well as the Deed of Trust in the amount of \$56,231.42. Heaton and Hildebrand went to Williams to discuss the matter, and on learning of the attitude of the local church officers, Williams suggested that "the file on the United Methodist Church of Valencia escrow be closed."⁴⁵ At that point Heaton rose to leave, but indicated that he would discuss the matter with the bishop before leaving town. Meanwhile Hildebrand had been reading the papers Williams had mailed to Valencia for the church officers to sign. He discovered that a full page of one of the contracts was missing. Williams or his secretary had failed to enclose it. The missing page indicated that the Conference would attempt to collect the \$92,315.13 only in the event that the local church sought to withdraw from the Conference or denomination.

The Deed of Trust in the amount of \$56,231.42 bears interest at the rate of 1% per annum with interest payable quarterly.⁴⁶ Other funds were needed to cover the cost of items omitted from the contract. On June 2, 1974 the

⁴⁵Personal conversation in the office of George Williams, 5250 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles, Ca., July 31, 1974.

⁴⁶Deed of Trust, July 24, 1974.

building committee had met with Hildebrand following the ground breaking ceremony and estimated that an additional \$40,000 would be needed due to escalating costs, and also, due to the fact that some essential items had been deleted from the construction contract.⁴⁷ District superintendent Hinshaw offered the possibility of additional funding.

The Wesley Church in Woodland Hills, California would be closed or merged with another United Methodist Church due to the fact that it had not grown, and was not paying its own way. Hinshaw indicated that the net proceeds from the sale of that property could be made available to the Valencia church. Subsequently he reported to Heaton that \$25,000 to \$30,000 would be realized from the sale, and that the bishop's cabinet had taken the necessary action to guarantee that the funds would come to the Valencia church, even after Hinshaw's reappointment to the pastorate (He was then in his sixth year, which is the limit of office for district superintendents).⁴⁸ Unfortunately for the Valencia church the Wesley Church was merged with the Canoga Park First Church, and Galvan, the new superintendent, had no knowledge of any agreement Hinshaw had worked out for the benefit of the Valencia congregation.

⁴⁷ Discussion of these items will be covered in the next chapter.

⁴⁸ Conversation between Lawrence Hinshaw and Kenneth Heaton, Monday, December 19, 1973, Knollwood United Methodist Church.

Yet another possibility remained for additional funding. The Board of Missions and Church Extension administered a revolving fund for the aid of churches. The churches borrowing money paid seven and one half percent interest; investors were paid six and one half percent, and the Board kept one percent for its expenses in administering the fund. Hildebrand suggested to Heaton that if he could locate enough parishoners to loan \$40,000 to the fund, the Board would guarantee the loans, and the Valencia church would have use of the needed funds. By April 1, 1975 Heaton had interested several investors in the fund. One was willing to loan \$20,000,⁴⁹ two offered \$10,000 each,⁵⁰ and a fourth was willing to loan \$5,000.⁵¹ Heaton had attempted to communicate with Hildebrand several times regarding the latter's coming to Valencia to discuss investments with potential investors, but had been unable to locate him in his office by telephone, so on April 1 he decided to visit Hildebrand in his office without an appointment.⁵²

On arriving Heaton was surprised to find Andrus present. In discussing his concern to have Hildebrand visit Valencia, Heaton learned that yet another possibility for financing

⁴⁹Charles Amendt

⁵⁰Richard and Diane Bammel and Lyle and Virginia Schaefer

⁵¹Lester and Ruth Hiebert

⁵²1974 United Methodist Calendar and Workbook of Kenneth Heaton.

existed. Andrus suggested that the loan with the national Board of Global Ministries be increased to cover the additional needs. Hildebrand agreed to come to Valencia when he could find time to get away, and Heaton left, believing that the financial crisis had been settled. Unfortunately both Hildebrand and Andrus retired in June without ever resolving anything by way of additional financing for the Valencia church. Heaton felt left in the lurch. With the passage of time his parishoners invested their funds elsewhere, and the church was left in need of at least \$40,000. Andrus was succeeded in the New York office by Williams. Several month later John Kirkman, who replaced Williams in Los Angeles, approached Williams about refinancing the Valencia loan. He refused, and no one was surprised. Eventually Kirkman agreed to pay the bills for the Valencia church from operating funds of the Conference with the understanding that ultimately the church would find other sources of financing. He and Galvan favored having the church again find investors for the revolving fund of the Conference. On December 12, 1975 Kirkman agreed to forward brochures, explaining the revolving fund to the church. As of April 3, 1976 they had not been received, but there were no complaints heard in Valencia, because connectional United Methodism for all of its faults showed a benevolent attitude toward yet another mission -- the United Methodist Church of Valencia.

Summary

Financing for construction was sought from many sources: oil stocks, Security Pacific Bank, sale of the parsonage, two capital funds crusades, national Board of Missions loans, and donations from the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. The parsonage was sold. Two capital funds crusades netted \$65,400 in pledges. The church received two national Board of Missions' loans totaling \$130,000. The Annual Conference covered the rest of the indebtedness, which would have been much greater had not the local church members donated considerable time and talent during the course of construction. The next chapter will deal with the actual construction of the church.

Chapter 4

CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH

The very words construction of the church smack of a materialism alien to the Good News and foreign to the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth who was wise enough not to have considered construction of a building in which his followers could meet. But

the world measures success by looking at the numbers, income, buildings, and programs that the church has produced. . . . It will be hard. . . not to give in to these criteria.¹

It is to this world that the church is called to minister. "Christianity has always had to start with men wherever they were, not where they should be."² The world has its conception of what a church should look like, and it was this tool, the building, that the United Methodist Church of Valencia proposed using to win people to Christ, which incidentally is the number one priority of American Protestant Christendom.³ As an institution in society the

¹William A. McConnell, "An Open Letter to a New Church Pastor," in Robert C. Strom (ed.) Behold a New Thing (New York: United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1965) p. 13.

²Ibid., p. 29.

³Douglas W. Johnson and George W. Cornell, Punctured Preconceptions (New York: Friendship Press, 1972), p. 79. See also Wilhelm Anderson, "Further Toward a Theology of Mission," in Gerald H. Anderson (ed.) The Theology of the Christian Mission (New York: McGraw Hill, 1961), p. 313.

church still has a role to play. Vance Packard witnesses to this fact.

Since neighbors in many areas have become undependable at helping newcomers integrate into the new community, there is increasing dependence of affiliating with organizations that will quicken the newcomers' pace of involvement.

Churches play an important role here. Don't just go to church. . . . To become integrated you need to become an active churchgoer.

. . . About 50 percent of the membership of the Presbyterian church is transient, which perhaps reflects that church's appeal to corporate manager types.⁴

Finding itself in a community of managers the Valencia Methodists sensed that their building should reflect the projected values of the newcomers to the community,⁵ so that the church could grow. The plans were drawn,⁶ plan checked by the county,⁷ and permits⁸ taken out for the beginning of construction.

Grading

It has already been noted that the church building site sloped away from the street, and that fill dirt was needed.⁹ During the spring and summer the pastor of the

⁴Vance Packard, A Nation of Strangers (New York: Pocket Books, 1972), pp. 148-149.

⁵See Appendix B, questions 7, 8 and 9.

⁶The architect took seven months, instead of the promised two.

⁷Plans were submitted to county engineer on February 11 and were approved on April 12, 1974.

⁸\$1,348.40 was paid by the church for permits, and this did not include plumbing.

⁹See p. 6.

church daily sought out contractors who were digging swimming pools and begged for the dirt from the neighborhood backyards. Ladies of the church¹⁰ took turns calling contractors regarding fill dirt. Sundays the minister pleaded from the pulpit for dirt,¹¹ and he got it. When completed, the building pad at the rear of the church was eight feet above what it would have been without fill, and the church floor is now one foot above the level of the curb at the front of the church. \$25,000 was saved by begging for dirt,¹² and many, many, unnamed persons had the privilege of giving something to the church. Providing people with a way to give is a ministry in itself. "There is a genuine sense not only of pleasure but of self-fulfillment that comes with the experience of giving."¹³ Finally the grading was begun on August 26, 1974.¹⁴ The

¹⁰Donna Bruhn, Kathy Graves, Diane Bammel, Karen Burns, Hilda Phillips and others.

¹¹No pun intended.

¹²In addition to swimming pool dirt the church was able to acquire more from a new sewer installation in Newhall.

¹³Martin E. Carlson, Why People Give (New York: Council Press, 1968), p. 109.

¹⁴Heaton consulted with Hildebrand regarding default of the building contract if construction was not begun soon. Williams had insisted that construction be curtailed until the transfer of title of the building site to the local trustees was completed. Hildebrand agreed that construction perhaps should be begun, but Williams must not hear of it. The land transfer was completed on October 31, 1974.

contract signed on July 12 as a six month contract for the period of construction was destined to run almost twice that long. The grading was completed on September 10, and a soil report was filed with the county engineer.

The Electrical Contract

One evening following a district meeting at Santa Barbara Heaton stopped by to chat with a friend, Dallas Jones, who was manager of the General Motors Proving Ground in California, a Valencia resident, and a member of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Roman Catholic Church in Newhall. Jones had been a neighbor and friend of Raymond Greenlee. The conversation turned to the subcontracts and their costs. Before the evening was over Jones had agreed to supervise the installation of all electrical components, provided Heaton could recruit volunteer labor. Heaton had objected that Jones was taking on too much work, but Jones replied, "I just finished a 1.6 billion dollar test lab for G.M. Surely I can do this much for you."

Jones was invited to meet with the building committee. By this time James Paget, a Univac engineer, was serving on the committee. Paget was a veteran of the war in Viet Nam where he had served as an electrician among many other duties. No one on the committee knew of any electrician who could take out a county permit for the job, so Jones recommended hiring Al Giddens of Syd's Electric in Burbank to work on Saturdays and Sundays for \$10 per hour. Jones, Paget and

Giddens soon became the "electrical experts," in appearance very unlike the executives they really were.

The lowest bid for the electrical installation had been \$19,400. The general contractor estimated that \$7,250 would cover the cost of the materials; however, the architect's specifications called for only interior lighting, no exit lights, and no sanctuary light fixtures. The florescent lights bore no covers. In consultation with Giddens the building committee upgraded all light fixtures, added parking lights, exterior lights, sanctuary lights and exit lights, at the insistence of the county engineer -- the building inspector would have let it pass, as would the fire department, but the county engineer, Gene Bahl, would not. Giddens' estimate of the job by the time it was completed was \$35,000. It cost the church \$14,629.

Others also contributed to cutting costs.

The Air-conditioning Contract

James Moore greeted his minister after worship one Sunday at the doors of St. Stephen's Church with the offer, "When you get ready to build I'll do the heating and air-conditioning installation, and I can get all the parts at wholesale cost." According to the general contractor the low bid was \$21,400. Working week-ends and evenings Moore and his usual crew of Woody Woodruff, an employee of the Southern California Gas Company, Ken Craig, an I.T.&T. industrial engineer, and Sam Burns, director of Sun Oil's

explorations on the West coast, managed to keep ahead of the general contractor's progress. The longest delays were caused by the sheet metal supplier, whose components frequently did not fit together. The total cost for the complete installation was \$11,496.22, a saving of approximately \$10,000.

At one point a week-end was lost in the installation because the building inspector would not approve the blue prints for a heat chase in the roof on the educational wing of the church, even though the plans had been stamped, "Approved" by the county engineer. The volunteer, air-conditioning installers became carpenters. Orren Harris, a member of the building committee and an architect, redesigned the plans to the satisfaction of the inspector, and by the following Monday the union carpenters were able to continue with construction. There were yet other donations of labor.

Bouquet Canyon, Split-face Rock Walls

Robert Service, a Los Angeles County fireman, and grandson of Congregational missionaries to China volunteered to build a three foot high stone wall around the chancel, detailed in the plans. The low bid for the wall was \$2,960. On hearing of Service's proposal Floyd Johnson, a deputy sheriff with Los Angeles County, suggested he knew a man who owned a stone quarry, and he was certain the man would be happy to give the needed stone. H.A. Jones of American

Builders in Saugus donated the stone.¹⁵

When the stone wall was completed Heaton and Service were so impressed with their efforts that they proposed stoning two, twenty foot high walls behind the choir and the pulpit; the building committee approved, Jones donated more stone, and Service and Heaton were back at work on the wall. After his back slipped out of joint for the fourth time Service handed his trowel over to Ken Craig. Chuck Bruhn, Donna Bruhn, and Richard Schuerger took turns mixing mortar. Within four months of beginning the work was done, and impressed with the results Heaton and Service added a stone altar in the middle of the chancel. Herb Ellingson put a solid oak top on it, complimenting the stone beautifully. Total cost to the church for all the stone work was \$424. On the basis of the estimate for the three foot wall the church saved at least \$7,000 in the stone work. Not to be outdone by the men of the church the ladies had their projects too.

Painting and Pews

The ladies of the church gave several months of Wednesday mornings to the painting of kitchen, classrooms, office and rest rooms. Richard Bammel, Charles Bruhn and Rick Koski turned into "Jolly Green Giants" as they used a

¹⁵Richard and Diane Bammel donated the services of one of their messenger service company trucks to deliver the rock to the church.

spray gun in high winds to stain the beams and arches before the ceilings were installed: in fact the walls were not erected at that time. Travis Fetterolf assumed responsibility for preparation of all painting. Richard Bruce was paint foreman, though unofficially Florence Craig left many written instructions for those whose quality of workmanship she questioned. Her contribution was enormous. Frequently she spent full days at the church, alone, painting. The lowest bid for painting was \$5,496. The church spent \$1,187 on paint, but no one will ever know how much on aspirins, muscle relaxants and paint remover, not to mention allergy pills for those allergic to paint. The writer speaks from first hand experience.

A facet of painting that cannot be overlooked is the restaining of the pews, pulpit and altar top. These items were all purchased from the Camarillo United Methodist Church for \$1,000.¹⁶ Chuck and Donna Bruhn and Forest and Mary Casterline spent many, many hours refinishing the pulpit and pew ends; they were assisted by Kathy Graves, Diane Bammel and John and Thelma Price whose daughter, Carlitta, managed to get paint remover in her eye, and caused considerable scurrying by adults to get her to the emergency room of the local hospital. No permanent damage was done. Tragic as it was, it provided the occasion for

¹⁶Donated by Lyle and Ginny Schaefer and boys.

acts of compassion and love, as well as creating memories that will live forever in the minds of those who were present that day. Perhaps it was this kind of situation Rosemary Ruether had in mind when she wrote that

God's presence does not appear just in one time and place "once for all," but wherever reconciliation is established and man glimpses his unity and the unity of the world with its transcendent foundation and meaning.¹⁷

The pews purchased from Camarillo were not the proper length for the Valencia church. Twelve had to be shortened and twelve lengthened. Herb Ellingson, Ken Craig, Bill, Chuck, Bill and Sherry Brunelle, Lee Skidmore and Ken Heaton worked on the pews. Donna Bruhn, Betty Cravener and Mary Casterline scoured stores and wholesale outlets for a suitable fabric with which to recover them. Eventually the entire congregation enjoyed the comfort of padded pews.

Cabinets and Clean Up

The low bid for cabinets was \$3,885, and the contract allowed \$2,000 for clean up of the building site. The pastor did most of the clean up work, setting aside any length or width of board that he considered usable for construction of cabinets. Woody Woodruff and Forest Casterline turned their garages into woodworking shops. K-Mart proved to be the

¹⁷Rosemary Ruether, Liberation Theology (New York: Paulist Press, 1972), p. 10.

least expensive place to purchase counter-topping. For a cost of \$537.83 the church obtained about ninety feet of cabinets. Mary and Forest Casterline donated all the hardwood for the shelves and credenzas in the pastor's study. Forest made them in his garage.

Landscaping

From the beginning David Mastroleo, chairman of the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee, had offered to supervise the landscaping. He was able to get a 70% discount on all components for the irrigation system. One of his colleagues gave a bid of \$13,000 for a complete installation. The church paid \$4,000.

Mastroleo spent many week-ends riding tractor and trenchers getting the church grounds ready for the sprinklers, which are all controlled by an electric clock. When possible he brought out the needed equipment on week-ends from the Hillcrest Country Club in Century City where he is the superintendent.

During Heaton's vacation in August, 1975 Cravener asked Craig to supervise the construction of the block and plaster planter boxes in the front of the church. Clanton Block of Saugus provided all the necessary blocks for less than \$100, or about one-fifth of what they normally would have charged. Woodruff, Bruhn, and Skidmore were almost constant workers along with Craig.

Skidmore's eldest son, Steve, approached Heaton

about a project around the church of sufficient significance to satisfy the Boy Scout requirement for the rank of eagle scout. It was agreed that Steve would build the church sign -- a twenty-seven foot long, three and one half foot high, semi-circular wall, with carriage lamps on either end. The lettering, "The United Methodist Church of Valencia" was implanted in raised letters, and four floodlights cover the entire wall at night. Adult experts gave guidance, but young Skidmore did the bulk of the manual labor.

During the Advent season Heaton appealed to the congregation to purchase live Christmas trees, use them at home until the season passed, and then donate them to the church for a tax write-off. Many of the members responded to the offer, and the church had trees. At least fifty more trees were needed for the perimeter of the church yard. Los Angeles County notified the church that it would give another thirty days for the planting of the trees or "else" No one knew what the "or else" amounted to, but within two Sundays the needed \$800 was donated, after appeals were made from the pulpit. Again, Mastroleo was the savior, getting the trees for \$16 each while the average retail price was \$36-\$38. In this the church saved about \$1,000, but to cope with inflation the church needed all the breaks it could get.

Inflation

In the many months, if not years, the church lost in not getting on with construction multiplied thousands of dollars were lost. Had the estimated \$40,000 additional funding been available at the time construction was begun the church would have saved \$17,754.85 in costs. Between June, 1974 and June, 1975 the bids on heating and air-conditioning, parking lot, floor coverings and the electrical components rose \$17,754.85.¹⁸ At least three months of time was lost by the general contractor during the course of construction. Work came to a total halt because "someone misplaced the order for the arches and the beams."¹⁹ Thirty-five working days, or seven weeks of five day work weeks were lost due to inclement weather in Valencia while the general contractor working on the Camarillo church during the same period of time lost only one day. It was during this period of time that the pastor felt most keenly the need for closer job supervision on the part of the general contractor.

Supervision of Construction

Robert H. Ricciardi, the architect, was dismissed when he completed the plans for the church. This had been

¹⁸ Minutes of the Board of Trustees, the United Methodist Church of Valencia, December 10, 1975.

¹⁹ Conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Burton Michaelson, general contractor.

mutually agreed upon months earlier. Orren Harris, member of the building committee and an architect, agreed to take over supervision without reimbursement. This saved the church \$1,850.²⁰

Summary of Savings in Construction Costs

For persons who have had the privilege of being part of starting a new local church, it is an unforgettable experience. Like any birth of a new being, it is full of excitement and hope for the future.²¹

For the many in Valencia who became involved in the construction of the new church it was an unforgettable experience, and a very profitable investment from the standpoint of the assets of the corporation. An accounting of the savings is necessary to set an accurate appraised value on the completed structure.

These savings are thus documented: grading, \$25,000; electrical, \$20,371; air-conditioning, \$9,903.78; stone walls, \$6,576; painting, \$4,309; an accurate evaluation of the pews is not possible; however, the church did obtain one bid for pews alone, without pulpit from Overholtzer Furniture in Modesto in the amount of \$4,700; thus, it can be ascertained that at least \$2,200 was saved, allowing \$1,500 for refinishing and reupholstering the pews;

²⁰Supervision normally costs one per cent of the total contract.

²¹Jack M. Tuell, The Organization of the United Methodist Church (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), p. 61.

\$2,000 was saved in the cost of cleanup, and \$3,347.17 in the cabinets; credenzas, comparable to the ones in the pastor's study sell for \$500 each; the shelving material alone cost \$175; volunteer labor in landscaping was worth about \$9,000; and finally in supervision by the architect \$1,850 was realized. The total of donated labor adds up to \$85,731.95. In addition to donating labor many fixtures and furnishings were given during the course of construction.

Materials Donated During the Course of Construction

The youth of the church, the pre-school committee and the United Methodist Women held fund raisers, as well as gaining donations from their respective members. The late Rod Serling gave a dictaphone just two weeks before his untimely death. Charles Bruhn must be credited with soliciting this contribution. Two organs, office equipment, a desk, tables, and so on were received. Newhall Land and Farming Company installed two water hydrants. The total appraised value of all these gifts amounted to \$11,190. Building fund pledges, value of donated labor, and donations during the course of construction had a total value of \$162,321.95. The commitment of the Valencia Methodists to their building should never be questioned.

Some Reflections on the Construction of the Church

Flannery O'Connor has one of her characters in Wise Blood say, "Nobody ought to be without a place of their

own to be" ²² The same advice may be applied to congregations of faithful followers of religion. Identity is integral to growth. To Methodists it is a well-worn observation that Whitefield was a far more effective preacher than Wesley; much larger crowds attended his meetings, but Wesley was an organizer and a builder. When Whitefield died so did his following. But when Wesley died he left the world the Methodist Church. Many latter day prophets have been loud in disclaiming the efforts or organized religion, but usually they have been collecting salaries from the very institutions for which they see no need. One illustration of such anti-institutionalism, as it applies to buildings, is from Vance Packard, who quoted a Christian Century editorial in this respect. He wrote:

. . . The phenomenal mobility created by the increasing speed of the redistribution of the American population was forcing churches to radically rethink their mission to the world. "The churches cling nostalgically to traditional forms of architecture. . . . This is not a time for churches to build permanent temples. . . . Rather this is a time when churches should live in tents prepared on short notice to move toward and with the people." ²³

The naivete of believing the Christian Church can function without its institutions and buildings is to forget two thousand years of lively, and socially active history.

The church is needed in the suburbs as much as it ever has been needed anywhere. Drawing together the grace of God and the essential idealism of the people, the

²² Flannery O'Connor, Three (New York: New American Library, n.d.), p. 124.

²³ Packard, op. cit., p. 165. Packard failed to footnote the editorial.

church can help save the suburbs from becoming the madhouses of materialism they are so often caricatured as being.²⁴

The Church is needed in the suburbs, and the overwhelming response of the people in Valencia to the construction of a new church witnesses to their desire for and need of the Church.

²⁴Carl Thomas, "Where Do I Begin?", Strom, p. 29.

Chapter 5

REFLECTIONS ON CONSTRUCTION

From the disadvantage point of only six months after the completion of construction it would be extremely easy to offer simplistic approaches to the problems encountered, draft a proposal with check lists, and believe a final solution for all future church construction projects had been written. The fact that no two churches, communities, land encumbrances or pastoral personalities are alike precludes simplistic solutions. Pontifical proclamations will not be heard in today's world.

The churches must change their structures if they are to accomplish their particular task in modern society. There is one change in particular that is imperative. . . . The notion of faith as obedience is authoritarian, yet it has shaped so much of the life of the churches. Even the organizational church life has been affected, as is evident in authoritarian influences that shape the social and religious position of the minister or priest. . . . These and many other authoritarian elements prevent the Church from performing adequately in secular society.¹

Indeed the churches must change in structure, but to pattern them after the forms of effective business enterprises would not solve the problem of how to construct a new chapel, temple or meeting house. Perhaps the Church can never be "good business."

¹Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 93

The questions and qualms of conscience arise when one measures the church in its relationships to society, particularly to the facts of modern industry. It is at this point where it seems to me that we had better admit failure than to claim any victory.

. . . Modern industry, particularly American industry, is not Christian.²

So wrote Reinhold Niebuhr nearly fifty years ago, but his judgements still stand today, if Watergate and the Lockheed pay-offs are to be believed. However, the intent of this study is to bring to light the potential for improvement in the functioning of the institutional Church, which the present writer believes in to the extent that he has given twenty years to its service and intends to continue until forced to retire. His infatuation with the institution has diminished little, if any, in all of these years. "What's good for the Church, is good for the world, and what's good for the world, is good for the Church," is his commitment. So, if lessons can be learned from principles of business administration, let us learn. This writer is not alone in viewing the business world as an arena from which to learn lessons for faith.

Jürgen Moltmann has noted that "both hope and planning have their foundation in suffering and dissatisfaction with the present, though planning appears only in business theory. . . ."³

² Reinhold Niebuhr, Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic (Cleveland: World, 1957), p. 224.

³ Jürgen Moltmann, Hope and Planning (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 178.

In an age when the Church seeks to take a holistic view of humankind it is incumbent upon churchmen to explore the world of people. In our day this includes the business world. Moltmann further states that both hope and planning "find in new possibilities ways leading toward another future."⁴ It is this hope for another future that presses the writer on to affect avenues of ease for future people who may be involved in building new churches.⁵

This sense of the future first had to be stimulated by Christianity and by industrialization. Moreover, . . . man's freedom is realized in a changeable world. The field of hope and planning is summarized historically, by means of the "future"; ontologically, by means of "possibility"; and anthropologically, by means of "freedom".

By planning, we understand an "anticipatory disposition for the future (Haseloff)."⁶

Planning is seen as a discipline derived from the business world, but a discipline that "finally leads us to the question of what it is that men actually wish, hope and search for."⁷ Thus viewed planning has its place alongside other theological pursuits and may be viewed as a worthwhile, and Christian undertaking. But how can we prepare for the future without overturning the stones of the past? It is out of the foregoing theological anxieties that an attempt

⁴Ibid.

⁵Probably the construction of new churches will never be easy!

⁶Ibid., pp. 178-179.

⁷Ibid., p. 180.

is made to analyze the foregoing chapters of this text.

Proposed Solution to Rapid Turnover of Leadership

The changing of district superintendents every six years is normal and should not interrupt development of a new parish; however, four superintendents in four years would be disruptive to the program of any district of any denomination. This was the situation of the United Methodist Church of Valencia in its first four years. Why Valencia was a part of the Santa Barbara District in 1969, then the Pasadena District in 1970, and once again the Santa Barbara District has never been satisfactorily explained. Under such circumstances it would have seemed advisable to make the mission answerable, only and directly to the Board of Missions, and more specifically under the direct supervision of the executive secretary of the Board. Even his selection of a pastor with whom he could work, and in whom he had total confidence, would have been advisable. Obviously the executive secretary would have to be the coordinator of mission policy with such a rapid succession of superintendents.

Another possibility would be to create mission districts, composed of only mission churches and staffed by pastors with special expertise in church growth, church construction, financing and planning. All mission level churches in the Conference would be under the supervision of one superintendent. Uniform building designs could be developed with varying facades to complement different

communities. At this point eight per cent of building costs could be eliminated.⁸

The rapid turnover of pastors, apparently was caused by low salary. Both Taylor and Brossmer sought extra employment to add to their income. Heaton cited this and received an increase of one hundred dollars a week, eight and one half months after arriving in Valencia; it appeared to him that the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee had not previously seen the relationship between ineffective leaders (ineffective due to outside employment) and salary paid. When the issue was called to their attention and referred to the Administrative Board it received reasonably prompt attention. From an ethical viewpoint, it is this writer's contention that more, honest, open discussion of financial needs of pastors with their committees could result in overall higher incomes, elevated self-images, and more effective ministry. The Westlake Village United Methodist Church is an example of this approach.

In Westlake Village the United Methodist Church was begun at the same time as the Valencia church. An "expert in new church development" was brought in from New York for two years and paid a salary of \$14,000⁹ by the Conference. at the end of two years the church reported 295 members,

⁸Architect's fees normally are eight per cent.

⁹Personal conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Lawrence Hinshaw.

\$440,000 worth of real estate, and total paid out by the local church of \$40,572. In contrast in Valencia where the pastor's total support¹⁰ amounted to \$8,050¹¹ the year end report indicated 106 members, a vacant lot worth \$100,000 and a parsonage valued at \$42,000.¹² Perhaps it is too simple an explanation to suggest that pastor's salary is the only variable between the two projects, but it does need to be noted that the first pastor in Valencia was very well-liked, warmly received by the civic clubs, and the entire community. He was an exceptionally capable person, but to sustain his level of living he believed it was necessary to work at another job. Perhaps the relevant question is: who was short-changed, the church or the pastor?

A final consideration that should appeal to many pastors is the possibility of owning his own home. In an area of quick growth and rapid appreciation in real estate values the minister should be given "a piece of the action." This offer was extended Valencia's third pastor, and it has proven to be an extremely effective incentive for achievement.¹³ The second minister's wife complained vehemently

¹⁰Salary, travel, utilities and no fringe benefits.

¹¹Southern California Arizona Conference, Journal (1972), p. 181.

¹²Ibid., p. 557.

¹³See Appendix V regarding duration of ministers' service in a given appointment when he owns his own home as opposed to living in a parsonage.

that she "could not live in her own home as she had in their previous appointment."¹⁴ Since she had grown up in Methodist parsonages, and had married a minister she knew whereof she spoke. Unfortunately her concern for a home was a factor in her husband's decision to leave the pastoral ministry.¹⁵ It is the impression of the writer that the Annual Conference leadership would like to overlook the pros and cons of home ownership by the pastor, as being a concern beneath his consideration, just as so many laypersons would like to believe that ministers' children are all born by immaculate conception! In listing the basic subsistence needs at least one school of thought has included "food, clothing and housing common to the whole human race."¹⁶ One who interviewed all retiring ministers for a period of seven years from the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church noted that

"eighty to eighty-five per cent of them go to live with their children or other relatives because they cannot afford to even get into Methodist retirement homes."¹⁷

Is it any wonder some men of the cloth feel called to other ministries?

¹⁴Personal conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Virginia Greenlee Schaefer.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶W. Warren Haynes and Joseph L. Massie, Management Analysis (Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 105

¹⁷Personal conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Richard Brooks, pastor, United Methodist Church, Camarillo, Calif.

Guidance for the Planning Phase of Church Building

Choosing an architect in the county in which one is going to build should ensure much more rapid plan checking by county officials. There is no guarantee, but it is assumed the local architect will know the expectations of the local county engineer's office. Better yet, he may be personally acquainted with the staff. The attempt to save \$2,000 already invested with the architect on the part of the Valencia church¹⁸ proved an ill-advised course of action. The miles between the architect's office and the building site precluded his supervision of construction and caused many hours of anxiety. Obviously, a prepackaged architectural plan for Conference-wide use, for at least first units would be beneficial to many young churches.

With regard to Conference rules in relation to church construction, it must be said that good guidelines are given, but there simply are not enough of them. Even the Book of Discipline could be improved upon; it dictates that:

the local church shall acquire a fee simple title to the lot or the lots on which the building is to be erected, by deed of conveyance. . . and shall pay the purchase price thereof in full before beginning construction.¹⁹

¹⁸See p. 21 regarding the \$2,000 invested with the original architect.

¹⁹The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church (Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1968), p. 142

What is to be done in the case of a mission church that has no funds with which to pay for a lot? It was the assumption of the Valencia church that this paragraph did not apply to its situation because the Conference held a \$56,000 lien against the property; thus, it was concluded it would be unthinkable to transfer the land title to the local trustees. The Conference treasurer apparently took a very different view and insisted on transferring the land to the local church. The executive-secretary of the Board of Missions and the new district superintendent took a "hands off" attitude, and the church bowed to the treasurer's pressure, but questioned the rightness of his action.²⁰ The transfer of the title to the building site took about four months. It would appear that one of two other possible courses of action should have been considered.

In general the Book of Discipline statement above is a necessary safeguard to the connectional system of the church. It is indicative, however, of the fact that absolute categorical rules cannot be followed implicitly. Every situation is different. Flexibility for exceptional cases should be detailed in the Book of Discipline.

In the case of the United Methodist Church of Valencia the transfer of title to the land should have been transacted at the time the Journal²¹ began reporting the

²⁰See p. 65 ff.

²¹Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1970), p. 561

mortgage on the land as a debt of the local church in 1970. If, however, the church could not pay in full for the land before beginning construction, the title to the land should have been retained by the Board of Missions and Church Extension to satisfy the cited requirements of the Book of Discipline herein under consideration. This logic likewise would have dictated that the corporate officers of the Board of Missions and Church Extension should have signed the building contract, if they held the title to the land.

The question may be raised, "Who should determine when to transfer the title of property to a mission church? Should it be transferred when the church is organized? When the District Board of Building and Location approved building plans or financing for the mission church? Or when the district superintendent and the executive-secretary of the Board of Missions and Church Extension co-sign mortgages from the national division for construction loans?" To have waited until a building contract was signed, as the treasurer of the Conference did when he had on file month-to-month progress reports of the Valencia building committee, was to have waited too long. The fact is that he was busy with other Conference business and really had no time for supervision of mission churches, but the four month delay he caused by his action cost the church thousands of dollars worth of inflation in the extra contract items -- parking lot, electrical, heating and air-conditioning, floor coverings and irrigation system.²²

²²See p. 96.

Escrow Officer

When George Williams agreed to serve as escrow officer for the United Methodist Church of Valencia and the national division he did so in order to save the church escrow officer fees and with the full knowledge that he was already overworked. He acted in good faith. In retrospect it is questionable whether the local church building committee would have pursued the course of construction had an independent, local escrow officer been in charge until Hildebrand or his appointed representative had secured in writing the additional funding needed to complete the project.²³ It would seem advisable in future construction of churches for the Conference to work with an independent escrow officer for the protection of the office of Conference treasurer as well as the integrity of the local churches.

When Williams left his post and was succeeded by Kirkman errors occurred that caused no little amount of chagrin in the local church. The local church had an open account for miscellaneous construction components needed during the course of construction. Eventually Kirkman insisted on paying this account from escrow funds.²⁴ Unfortunately he waited approximately four months to make the payment and the church lost its ten percent discount as

²³See p. 68

²⁴See p. 117

well as considerable face with the local merchant. When the bill was finally paid payment was made in duplicate. The local church used the overpayment as a credit with which to purchase lumber for renovation of the pews.

All sheet metal components were purchased from Hoffman Heating and Air-conditioning in Reseda. Hoffman presented the church a bill for \$167.02 in August. Kirkman accepted the bill for payment. By January it had not been paid. The local church paid the amount out of operating expenses. Eventually Kirkman located the original bill in the escrow file for the sale of the parsonage.

The landscaping was done by David Mastroleo, a member of the building committee. He was able to procure all irrigation materials at a seventy percent discount. The final statement for payment was sent to the Conference office on February 5, 1976. When payment had not been received by March 26 Mastroleo was justifiably irate. He tried for two days unsuccessfully to reach Kirkman. Eventually a secretary advised Mastroleo that Kirkman thought he had already paid the bill. At the time under discussion the whole Conference leadership was preoccupied with the refinancing of Pacific Homes. About \$6 million was needed. The bills of the Valencia church were of small significance in contrast to the crisis at Pacific Homes. The cost of an independent escrow officer would have been more than justifiable in view of the misunderstandings which arose.

Written Commitments

The writer grew up in a predominantly Jewish community. There a story was circulated during his childhood, which ran something like this: a Jewish father wished to teach his son the first lessons of the business world. The child was only five or six years of age. The father placed him in the second story window of their home and went to the lawn below. Then he shouted up to the son on the window ledge, "Jump, Sammy, jump." The young lad shook his head, shocked at the father's command. Eventually in angry tones the father shouted, "Sammy, when your father says jump, you'd better jump, if you don't want a whipping. You know your father will catch you. Jump!" The story goes that the little lad jumped. The father stepped back, letting his son land with full force on the lawn, leaving him unconscious. When finally he came to, and had stopped crying enough to hear what his father was saying, he heard, "Now, son, that is the first lesson of life. Never trust anyone, even your own father."

Likewise it might be said to young ministers, "Be sure you know who's going to catch you before you jump, and be sure you have his commitment in writing."

From the brief history of the United Methodist Church of Valencia it is at once apparent that many verbal commitments were made, but nothing ever came of them, because no one could make them stick. Examples of these

are: (1) Hinshaw's promise of the proceeds from the sale of the Woodland Hills property, (2) Hildebrand's acknowledgment of the need for an additional \$40,000 before construction began, (3) Andrus' offer to refinance the entire mortgage, and (4) Brooks' words of assurance, which have not been referred to previously, "Go ahead and get into construction; you'll raise the money somehow by the time you need it." All of these suggestions were made by good men of integrity with honest intention, but when a new superintendent and a new Conference treasurer heard these lines, their expressions said more than words ever could -- they appeared to question that these commitments had ever been made. Written commitments would have saved at least face for the local church pastor. Unfortunately the institution founded on faith in God frequently lacks faith in humankind.

As would be expected the new district superintendent was reluctant to offer any solutions or make commitments regarding the extra funds needed. On the other hand the pastor allowed guilts to arise for the problems that were beyond his control. In the presence of the superintendent he became defensive, and a strained relationship existed where one would feel there should be rejoicing over the accomplishment of eight year's dreams. Maslow offers some comfort:

"Defensiveness can be as wise as daring; it depends on the particular person, his particular status and the particular situation in which he has to choose."²⁵

²⁵Abraham H. Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being (New York: Van Nostrand, 1968), p. 54.

In dealing with people, whether they are Christian or pagan, clergy or clerks of contractors, in the situation of building churches, along with many other situations, be sure their communication is in writing, and then file it.

On Site Supervision

Typically on site supervision from day to day should be done by the architect, as well as the general contractor or his superintendent. In the Valencia situation, the only supervision frequently given was provided by the pastor. No other member of the church, or building committee could be in town during the day. It was this kind of supervision that revealed that compaction had not been done as required by the contract over the whole plumbing and drainage system. When the builder refused to provide mechanical compacting, the pastor let a sprinkler hose run all one night and settled the ground six inches to a foot. The general contractor then sent his own son out on the job to see that the plumber properly compacted the rest of the ground. Did the end justify the means? Let the reader decide for himself. On sight supervision should be given to any job by someone with strong commitment to the project, preferably someone who will have to occupy the building himself for years to come.

Staff for the Mission Church

One day in anger the writer suggested to his new

district superintendent, "The next time you want to start a new church, send out two or three pastors. You have no conception of the pressures I live with!" In retrospect, and with some degree of objectivity the concept of a multiple ministry would probably work better in a new church situation than anywhere else. One minister could be the public relations agent of the church, preaching, calling and attending civic functions. Ministerial support would have to be provided by the Board of Mission and Church Extension. The second pastor could be an equal in importance by overseeing the communications that are so voluminous during construction and planning for construction.²⁶ In Los Angeles County there are nine separate divisions of county government that must approve of proposed buildings before a permit can be issued. If a staff person cannot be provided for the mission church, then a Conference official should develop working relationships with various governmental agencies to expedite plan checks and zoning variances.

At the very least the new church should be provided with secretarial help, hopefully someone other than the pastor's family. If they are expected to serve in such capacities, they should be reimbursed for their time in order for them to maintain their good feelings toward the

²⁶Such a model was employed at Grace Baptist Church, Newhall, California.

church. The local church, just like the annual Conference, needs staff with which to carry out its program. To permit a pastor to spend half his time doing secretarial work is a misuse of funds. He has more important things to do, but seldom does the church, local, district or Conference face up to this waste of manpower. "Responsible theology must . . . engage in institutional criticism. . . ." ²⁷ "In general . . . church organization is exceedingly costly, clerically dominated, and top heavy," ²⁸ but the least expensive way in terms of money is not always the best way to get results for the kingdom of God. It is with this concern in mind that the present study was originally undertaken. In addition to the problems of staffing are the related concerns of communications.

Communication with Conference Officials

It is already evident from the foregoing pages that communication between local church, the district and the annual Conference, as well as the pastor, left something to be desired. An anonymous writer has written that

the seminaries must tell the young student of the power structures he will encounter, of the harsh criticism . . . , of denominational pressure toward conformity, of the harassment by cliques, of the discontentment

²⁷"Jürgen Moltmann, The Experiment of Hope (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 102.

²⁸Tracey K. Jones, Jr., Our Mission Today (New York World Outlook Press, 1963), p. 145.

. . . . They must equip him to handle criticism and to spot the most deadly game of games people play -- self-righteousness.²⁹

In the church self-righteousness frequently gets in the way of communication, especially when it is one's own self-righteousness. The intimacy of the content of these pages is written with a sincere attempt to be objective.³⁰

During his superintendency Hinshaw was a frequent visitor in Valencia. Between visits he called on the telephone. His presence conveyed more than his oral speech. As Hildebrand neared retirement he became increasingly difficult to reach for guidance, which probably could be accepted and expected. Williams at no time visited Valencia. Williams has more recently said, "We are not assigned to go out and start new churches, but we stand ready to help . . . with that task."³¹ Such appeared to be his stance while in Los Angeles. He was always prompt in answering letters, usually in lengthy detail, but he never in the minutest detail deviated from what he believed to be the rules of the Conference. Andrus twice visited Valencia during Heaton's ministry. His presence conveyed the message that the national division was behind the church's undertaking. In

²⁹ Pastor X, How to Murder a Minister (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1970). pp. 26-27.

³⁰ In the interests of objectivity the writer has reviewed the interpretations given herein with several parishoners. One insisted, "Tell it like it happened," and so the goal of this monograph is to record history, as well as analyze it.

³¹ "Criticisms Unfounded; 'It's Alive and Well,' Say National Division Officials," United Methodist Reporter (Dallas, August 8, 1975), p. 3.

a twenty-two month period Galvan visited the most heavily-in-debt-per-capita church in the Conference infrequently. Once he came with Andrus, a second time alone to conduct an Annual Charge Conference, and two more times in the presence of Kirkman. In his second year Galvan was too much in demand by the general church to give time to the individual charge conferences. His fourth visit was a result of Cravener's ultimatum that if Kirkman and Galvan cared to visit with the trustees the meeting would be held in Valencia at an hour convenient for the trustees and not at the dinner hour in Galvan's office in Van Nuys. Galvan's commitment to the national church coupled with his misunderstanding of the heavy schedules of the members of the Valencia building committee contributed to a breakdown in communications. In addition to this it was apparent that he had no solutions to the need for additional funding in Valencia.

In July of 1975 the Valencia pastor invited the bishop and the district superintendent to the consecration of the church at their convenience in the fall months. In October Galvan indicated that he had no knowledge of such an invitation. The pastor had initiated it by telephone calls both to the superintendent and the bishop's secretary. After Heaton forwarded a copy of the original letter to Galvan, he then indicated that he had received the original communication. Perhaps to the reader, unemotionally committed to the life of the Valencia congregation, the absence of the superintendent and bishop from the

consecration service of a new church is of little significance, but it loomed as a large issue to the building committee, the council on ministries, and the chairman of the administrative board. There was no commitment from either the bishop or the superintendent that they would attend the formal consecration of the church. For a time there was no communication.

Without communication people develop a distorted view of what others are doing, and these views are likely to result in hostility. . . . If members of a group imagine a "threat" from the outside -- and it is easy for human beings to fall into this pattern -- they join the other members in a defensive compact against the outsiders. . . . Such defensiveness may lead to open conflict or to its opposite, the repression of ill-feeling³²

Cravener resorted to open conflict with the superintendent and bishop. He called both men, made a strong case for their attendance at the consecration, and they eventually came.

The above indicated problem can be explained in part by the fact that only the formal structure of the Conference organization was known to the Valencia Methodists. A new bishop, a new district superintendent, a new treasurer, and a new executive-secretary of the Board of Missions and Church Extension (now known as the Board of Global Ministries) neutralized the influence the church believed it had established with the previous officials of the Conference.

³²Haynes and Massie, p. 83.

The problem of formal structure and informal organization has always been with us. Chester I. Barnard wrote about this concern.

. . . When formal organizations come into operation, they create and require informal organizations.

It seems not easily to be recognized without long and close observation that an important and often indispensable part of the formal system of cooperation is informal. . . . This is true not only of business organizations but also of political organizations, governments, armies, churches and universities.

. . . One will repeatedly hear that "You can't understand an organization or how it works from its organization chart, its charter, rules and regulations, nor from looking at or even watching its personnel." "Learning the organization ropes" in most organizations is chiefly learning who's who, what's what, why's why, of its informal society. . . .

Informal organizations . . . have only been studied, so far as I know, at the production level of industrial organizations.³³

An illustration of how the informal organization worked in the construction of the United Methodist Church in Valencia is given to illustrate the above point.

The building committee received five bids from general contractors.³⁴ All were too high. As anticipated by the committee, when contacted Hildebrand suggested removing from the contract all items that could be trimmed out without violating the building code of the county. This

³³Chester I Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 121.

³⁴Bidders and their bids were: Dan Gerstenberger (\$265,718), Ken Miller (\$224,536), Lawrence Dick (\$221,000), James A. Hill (\$219,502), and Burton Michaelson (\$213,900), according to the Building Committee Minutes, the United Methodist Church of Valencia, May 20, 1974.

was done, and Heaton returned to Hildebrand's office with the new contract price of \$184,799.00. Hildebrand indicated that he was satisfied if the pastor was. The pastor explained that additional funds would be needed to cover the costs of items left out of the contract -- heating and air-conditioning, seating, landscaping, irrigation system and floor coverings. The executive-secretary said, "If you are satisfied, I am, but take the contract to Dick Brooks (chairman of district board of building and location) for his approval." Again the pastor presented the contract, and made the above mentioned explanations of need for additional funding. Brooks indicated that the local church trustees should accept the bid and get under construction. While visiting with Hildebrand, Heaton asked whether the Board of Building and Location as well as the Board of Mission and Church Extension should be called into session to approve the contract. Hildebrand indicated that what he, Williams, and Brooks approved would be acceptable to both boards since "none of the others ever come to meetings anyhow."³⁵ McGregor noted that in his study of informal organizations people "are violating the conventional principles of organization constantly, and in a great many ways."³⁶ Heaton had long since made the same observation

³⁵Personal conversation between Will Hildebrand and Kenneth Heaton.

³⁶Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 35.

and so never for a moment questioned the sage advice of Hildebrand, although he knew the Conference rules were specific:

The church congregation must have on hand (designated for this purpose) a minimum of 20% of the amount needed to complete the proposed building and/or land. . . . The annual payments of principal and interest on all property debts (including parsonage) must not exceed 25% of the total expenditures of the church. . . .³⁷

The resources of the local church were most deficient when aligned with the above mentioned rules.

The local church had been challenged to raise \$15,000, which it had done. The Board of Missions and Church Extension offered to donate \$30,000. The construction contract was for \$184,799. The Conference held a mortgage of \$56,000 on the building site, plus another mortgage of \$92,000 -- this amount covered the initial downpayment on parsonage, building site, "gift" of \$50,000 for the building site, as well as taxes and insurance paid on the land and parsonage. In addition to these "debts", \$30,000 to \$40,000 would be needed for extras to the contract, indicated above. The parsonage mortgage at the time was about \$30,000. The total of all these amounted to \$403,000, should demand ever be made for payment in full on all of them. The combined resources of the Conference and local church amounted to little more than ten percent, even though the Conference rule indicated 20% must be on hand.

³⁷ Southern California-Arizona Conference, Journal (1974), p. 336.

The repayment schedule called for about 50% of the church's annual budget. Legally, according to Conference rules these exceptions should have been approved by vote of the Annual Conference. No one ever suggested calling for such a vote.

The Valencia building committee viewed itself as a mission church, not subject to the usual rules of the Conference. As business managers they understood "informal structures," and accomodation to "informally ignoring rules," that adversely affected their goals. Later when Galvan and Kirkman went to Valencia and repeatedly began citing "Conference rules," their very terminology fell on deaf ears. The local church committee knew full well that Conference rules had repeatedly been ignored. Part of their rationale was the inflationary factor of the national economy of which Conference rules relating to church construction were silent. In 1974 the generally accepted rate of inflation was 12%. Thus, the committee reasoned that in eight years the building would be worth twice its initial cost or to put it another way, indebtedness would be 50% of the original, even if nothing were paid on interest. All of this was computed on the basis of the 1974 economy and dollar value.

The question of additional funding has been referred to repeatedly.³⁸ Kirkman insisted that the only way additional funding could be sought on a long term basis

³⁸ See p. 68.

would be through a vote of the annual Conference. He was the first to raise this issue. Galvan seemed to think that the local church building committee was unaware of Conference rules and repeatedly to the minister in charge he complained that a "communication problem" existed. Eventually one day the pastor in distain on the telephone thundered, "Elias, we have no communication problem. Our problem is that we do understand each other, and we don't approach the solution to the problem from the same perspective."

Indeed there were communication problems between the local church and the Conference. The new administration (i.e. district superintendent, treasurer, and probably the bishop and executive secretary of Global Ministries) apparently assumed that their predecessors had always followed the rules, but so often the rules that are written today are outdated tomorrow. Chester Barnard has written of this problem.

It is surprising how much that in authority theory is authoritative, in the best of organizations in practice lacks authority -- or in plain language, how generally orders are disobeyed. . . . In all of them, armies, navies, universities, penal institutions, hospitals, relief organizations, corporations, the same conditions prevail -- dead laws, regulations, rules, which no one dares bury but which are not obeyed. . . .³⁹

Kirkman elected to pay off the general contractor from current operational expenses of the Conference, rather than accepting the local church's offer of securing loans from its constituency for the Board of Missions and Church Extension revolving fund in July, but by August he

³⁹Barnard, pp. 162-163.

reconsidered and during the pastor's vacation asked the building committee to again seek loans from its members. Originally the pastor had made all of the overtures for loans from members in March of 1975. By September when the pastor returned from vacation all but \$15,000 of the original \$45,000 offered by members had been invested in other ventures. In view of all the past misunderstandings regarding the additional funding the trustees and finance committee met with Kirkman in December along with Galvan and requested that brochures, printed by the Conference be made available to the local church so that church members would know of a certainty what they could expect from their investments. Kirkman agreed to get these brochures to the church promptly, but they had not been received by mid-March of 1976. Indeed all of this time lag gave the church time to regroup its resources, recruit new members and new pledges, but in totality it projected a picture of a slow moving institution, unable, or unwilling to keep its immediate commitments.

Clarity of the issue of image cannot be given without appearing negatively critical, and so the following is written with reservation. Kirkman made three different appointments in August of 1975 with the building committee, and each time because of other more pressing issues had to cancel the meetings. He finally kept a fourth commitment. On July 10 he had met with the building committee and agreed to pay within ten days all on hand bills. Among

them was an \$11,319 parking lot, paving contract bill, payable to a local Newhall contractor. The pastor left on vacation on July 15, but on July 11 had called the contractor and reported that Kirkman would be paying the bill within ten days, which he had agreed to do. Thirty days later the irrate contractor was calling the church office daily for his payment. The secretary advised him of each of Kirkman's promised meetings, three of which were canceled. The imagery of disorganization in the treasurer's schedule caused the committee to question the systematization of his daily functions. With a hostile contractor on their hands and a series of broken engagements the building committee, it seems, had good reason to question the importance of their function within the Conference structure. Drucker has warned that

there is no formula to yield the "right" answers for . . . key decisions. But if given haphazardly and without awareness of their importance they will inevitably be the wrong answers. To have an even chance of being right, the key decisions have to be made systematically. This is one responsibility top management can neither delegate nor leave to others.⁴⁰

In 1968 Auren Uris warned that

"more and more, experts are suggesting that a manager's effectiveness will depend not on his skill in following some systematic procedure but on his interpersonal relationships with his subordinates."⁴¹

⁴⁰Peter F. Drucker, Managing for Results (London: Pan Books, 1967), p. 230.

⁴¹Auren Uris, Mastery of Management (Chicago: Playboy Press, 1968), p. 131.

Where both systematic procedure and a lack of effective interpersonal relationships exist there is bound to be hostility.

Repeatedly communications with Conference officials took weeks to consummate because the official was out of town, on vacation, or a district or world tour. One gets the impression that denominational leaders see themselves in pyramid organization structures wherein chain of command decisions alone are permissible. Almost all decision-making in the local church building committee had been arrived at by consensus before formal voting. If the church likens itself to the body of Christ, then it needs to move forward with Drucker's conception of the organization in mind -- biological organization rather than traditional pyramidal and militaristic models.⁴²

In spite of all that is written herein to the contrary the best solution to the communication problem with the Conference came in the person of Kirkman. Initially he came on strong and alienated, but he continued to return, five times in all. The pastor invited him to speak Laity Day. On that occasion Kirkman was seen as a concerned consultant from the office of Mother Church, not a bureaucrat sent out by the bishop. Unlike Williams before

⁴²Peter F. Drucker, Technology, Management and Society (London: Chaucer Press, 1970), p. 106.

him, Kirkman determined to learn the problems of the local church as seen by the elected leaders of the local church. From the perspective of chain of command he did not need to so inconvenience himself, but for the good of the Conference and the church, he came and communicated, shared of himself and was accepted as a brother in Christ. Through repeated visits and expressions of concern he finally rose above the level of the original threat he had been when he failed to keep his appointments with the local church. At the risk of being accused of offering too much negative criticism, one other incident that affected morale must be mentioned.

Maintaining Morale

When the construction phase of the church was nearly completed and the building committee had laid plans for the final painting, making of planter boxes and erection of a sign on the church lawn, the pastor left on a six week vacation, the first in three years. As already stated Kirkman met with the building committee on July 10 and took all bills in need of payment, agreeing to pay them within ten days. The pastor left town with every confidence in the committee fulfilling its tasks and the treasurer paying all bills. The treasurer indicated that he himself would be leaving on vacation July 18 and would meet with the building committee again before leaving. He did not.

Eventually Kirkman met with the building committee

on August 12. Before beginning construction the building committee had voted to have Harris, and Heaton approve all bills for payment in writing before sending them either to the Conference treasurer or the local church fund treasurer.⁴³ Apparently Kirkman faulted the committee for making the pastor one of the signatories of all construction bills along with Harris, supervisor of architecture. Galvan was also present and apparently agreed to the change of signatories. Thereupon Kirkman led the committee in a review of every bill presented to his office for payment which bore the pastor's signature.⁴⁴ The meeting lasted till midnight. The minutes of the meeting report that

as a procedural matter in the future, all bills forwarded to Conference Headquarters for payment will continue to be initialed by Orren Harris as contractor interface prior to initialing by Chairman of Building Committee.⁴⁵

⁴³To indicate the fact that these signatories were acceptable to the Conference treasurer there is in the Valencia church office a letter on file from the Conference treasurer's office regarding one bill which lacked the pastor's signature. The letter requests that the pastor endorse the bill so that payment may be made. It is dated, January 22, 1975.

⁴⁴Doubtless the intent was honorable, but the net result was to discredit the pastor's integrity.

⁴⁵Minutes of the Building Committee of the United Methodist Church of Valencia, August 12, 1975.

Further, Kirkman was to be invited to all future meetings of the building committee and trustees, receive monthly statements from all church treasurers, and be included "as a non-participating advisor in the fall planning session for the 1976 operating budget."⁴⁶

Heaton returned home from vacation to find a congregation suffering severely from low morale. To begin with, Kirkman had left the impression that he would attend every meeting of the building committee and further that no expenditures could be made without his approval. Meetings were held on August 19, August 27, September 8, September 10, September 23, October 7, and November 25 without Kirkman in attendance. Repeatedly the refrain was reiterated that "we can do nothing without Kirkman's approval." so the volunteers did little or nothing on week-ends, compared with the terrific accomplishments of the past. This problem of morale could not be construed as a normal "after-construction let-down." In the November 25 meeting Charles Bruhn announced his resignation. Morale was at the lowest ebb it had been at since before October 15, 1972, when the church had considered closing.

Bishop Gerald Kennedy has written "that people with the power of decision and yet incapable of any sustained attention put our society into a parlous condition."⁴⁷

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Gerald Kennedy, For Laymen and Other Martyrs (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 50.

Kirkman had made commitments to the committee which he obviously could not keep. His intentions were good, but his schedule left no time for attention to the details of the functioning of a mission church, when he had responsibility to over five hundred other churches in the Conference. The pastor discussed his concern with Kirkman's absence with his superintendent. As a student the pastor had read well

Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette which warned that

. . . Most ministers are inclined to take the view that the dissenting person will as a rule better achieve his results by working through regular channels than by disregarding them. The man who decides to gain his end regardless of constitution or previous customs, although he may be right under other standards, must be prepared to be treated as a rebel by the organization.⁴⁸

Something had to be done to improve the morale of the building committee and the church in general.

People who had previously donated at least one day a week to the church were resigned to "let the church set." It took months for the pastor to re-recruit his volunteers to get on with landscaping and recovering of the pews. The pastor had always been a working member of the labor details, morning, noon and night, whenever people were willing to give time, most frequently on Saturdays and Sundays. For months the pastor had begun his Sundays by carrying a large coffee purcolator to the church construction site before the sun rose, plugged it into the temporary electrical outlet,

⁴⁸Nolan B. Harmon, Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1928), pp. 122-123.

unlocked the tool and supply shed, and ladders that were chained to the rafters for security from theft. Then he would rush home, change into clerical garb, spend an hour and a half or two hours conducting worship and counseling at St. Stephen's Church where the Methodist congregation assembled and was usually back on the construction site by 11 a.m. The pastor had earned his rapport with his people. Unfortunately the Conference treasurer assumed he had the same rapport with the people as the pastor. He appeared to believe his office gave him instant commitment from the congregation, but he was soon exposed to the fact that it did not. At this point the informal organization structure proved much more impervious than the formal structure.

Months later the chairman of the building committee reported that

we appreciated what Mr. Kirkman did for us in assuming responsibility for funding of our church which was not previously covered by loans, gifts or cash on hand; however, his immaturity got in the way, and he made commitments that he could not keep. I just wish he would live up to them.⁴⁹

High morale and high performance are built upon "a reasonable degree of autonomy."⁵⁰ It is possible that connectional Methodism does not always provide for maximum autonomy and so contributed to the morale problem of local

⁴⁹Personal conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Donald Cravener, February 28, 1976.

⁵⁰McGregor, p. 99

churches. But there was another facet to the morale of the United Methodist Church of Valencia. The people had built the church themselves they believed, and so they would fight to the death for its survival.

This sense of commitment could not have been achieved had an alternate method of construction been followed. During a Council of Ministries retreat to Pacific Palisades in February following construction Rev. Richmond Johnson, program counselor from the Conference staff, was most impressed with the "high spirit of the group."⁵¹ Much of this must be traced to the amount of manual labor donated by members to make the church their church.

Persons came to the city's periphery before organizations and institutions arrived. The people themselves organized and set up appropriate social and economic structures. Suburbia means people rather than places or things.⁵²

The people of Valencia live in various subdivisions with a clubhouse, pool and tennis courts in each. A homeowner's association, elected annually, administers all functions of the club house as well as approving all changes of colors of homes, rearrangement of landscaping and so on. As a result community spirit, sense of pride in ownership, local autonomy, and the feeling of control over the future run

⁵¹Personal conversation between Kenneth Heaton and Richmond Johnson, February 8, 1976.

⁵²Frederick A. Shippey, Protestantism in Suburban Life (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), p. 79.

high. It was the developer's desire that a small community church be constructed for each subdivision to serve three to four hundred families. While this has not been achieved the sense of community so needful for the establishment of a new church has permeated every undertaking in the construction of the new United Methodist Church.

Summary

One who writes critically on an undertaking such as the construction of a church in the first months of its completion hazards the sandtraps and water holes of subjectivity and overprotection of his new creation, which must be capable of standing on its own legs. The business world does offer some valuable directions for the Church to follow. It is heartening to see that the Conference Board of Global Ministries has adopted a "management by objectives" report format in the 1975 Journal of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Inasmuch as the United Methodist Church of Valencia was adversely affected by a rapid succession of district superintendents, pastors and other Conference officials, there may be some merit in considering the establishment of mission districts, under the direct supervision of the Board of Missions and Church Extension, provided the leadership of that office were in the hands of an avid church builder. Traditionally mission church establishment

has been left to novices in the ministry. There have been exceptions, but this reality has usually obtained because of low salaries and long hours of work. Some may challenge the call for higher pastor's salaries, but a second look should be taken at the effectiveness of the typical Black pastor in a Cadillac of a generation ago,⁵³ and the ineffectiveness and inability to lead middle-of-the-road Protestant pastors today. Not infrequently it was the above indicated Black minister who led his people to equal rights with whites in American society. Ministers who own their own homes tend to stay longer, produce more new members, and have more "successful churches."⁵⁴

A local architect should be selected, residing in the county where construction will be done. The Book of Discipline and the Conference Rules should be more detailed. Written commitments should be demanded from every person who makes a commitment to the building program of the church. This includes volunteers for labor, just as much as pledges of funding from bishops, or their appointed representatives. On site supervision should be given by a knowledgeable member of the building committee on a day-to-day basis in consultation with the architect and the builder. The Annual Conference should be able to get "more

⁵³ Obviously this is a caricature in part, but a valid one.

⁵⁴ By successful the writer means, active, growing in membership and finances, and sought after as an appointment by other pastors.

mileage for its money" by training teams of ministers or employing teams of trained ministers in church construction and parish development. The Westlake Village Church achieved with expert leadership in three years what required eight years in Valencia. A multiple staff approach for mission churches should be attempted by United Methodists. More specific procedures should be developed for the transfer of titles to property from the Board of Missions and Church Extension to the mission churches.

There is no substitution for face-to-face communications between people, but these communications must always be followed by written interpretations. Recognition must be made of the power of informal structures within any organization, and they do exist within the United Methodist Church. Outdated rules and guidelines should be reviewed and discarded. Changes in leadership bring into play new interpretations of rules, which may vary from those of former leaders. Interpersonal relationships are of the utmost importance for the free flow of information in the construction of churches, as well as any other institutions. Interruptions of chain-of-command relationships can devastate morale. Office does not automatically give authority. Indeed, actions do speak louder and clearer than words. The next chapter will analyze ethical issues related to the construction of the church.

Chapter 6

ETHICS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH

The details of management of the construction of the United Methodist Church of Valencia are given on the foregoing pages in the hope that the readers may learn from history. Dietrich Bonhoeffer warned that

history rides rough-shod. . . . With a frankness and offhandedness which no other earthly power could permit itself, history appeals in its own cause to the dictum that the end justifies the means.¹

It would be simple to say, "Well, the church got built, didn't it? So what if some things were not according to the Book of Discipline?" For some the rationalization may simply be that the completion of the construction of the church building was all that was desired. Any means to attain that end were justifiable. Others may object that any infringement upon the rules of the church would be adequate cause for retreat from any consideration of construction. Between these two poles of opinion the building committee agonized again and again. The Book of Discipline was read and reread by many members of the building committee. Conference correspondence was reviewed. Minutes of meetings with the District Board of Building and Location were almost memorized. The committee

¹Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Macmillan, 1955), p. 76.

was constituted of good, moral Christians intent on doing what was right, but who recognized that they were not in a perfect situation with perfect rules where perfect personalities functioned. Joseph Fletcher has postulated that "when the 'ideal' and the 'practical' combine forces creativity follows."² The ideals of religion met head-on with the practical problems of the business world that the members of the committee knew altogether too well.

In their first meeting with the District Board of Building and Location the committee had gathered to learn from the wisdom of the leaders of the church, they thought. Unfortunately the District Board had the effect of giving a scolding to a small child, who had dared to think he could live apart from his parents' constant supervision. The chairperson of the District Board arose in the meeting, and pointing his long arm and finger at the chairman of the building committee, said, "Man, whenever you get ready to build a \$100,000 home, you'd better know how you are going to finance it." Twenty years earlier the chairman of the building committee had built a \$100,000 home. It was at this point that the ethics of the business world began to surface in the minds of the members of the building committee.

²Joseph Fletcher, Moral Responsibility (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), p. 161.

At the next meeting of the District Board of Building and Location the building committee members all dressed in conservative business suits. The circular arrangement of chairs was abandoned for a formal row-upon-row seating. Each member of the building committee was assigned a specific aspect of the "sales pitch." As they made their respective presentations they were introduced with their college degrees and job descriptions in industry and business. Detailed analyses of projected community and congregational growth were presented along with graphs and charts, as well as area maps. The meeting was opened with formal prayer by the pastor after he had been introduced by the chairman. A collection was taken with the understanding that none of the Valencia people would put anything less than a \$20 bill in the collection plate. This motivated generous giving from the members of the District Board of Building and Location. In essence nothing new was said from what had been conveyed at the previous meeting, but the District Board was thoroughly convinced that the building committee had "done its homework." Many of the members of the building committee confessed that they were disgusted that they had had to resort to such image building to get across their message to district officials. Previously they had assumed that because they were fellow United Methodists the district officials would hear them and believe them without the wraps of the business world, but their assumption had been wrong. The question of whose

ethics to follow arose repeatedly.

Business Ethics

Every executive possesses, independently of the position he occupies, personal moral codes. When the individual is placed in an executive position there are immediately incumbent upon him, officially at least, several additional codes that are the codes of his organization. Codes of organization are themselves accruals largely of intangible forces, influences, habitual practice, which must be accepted as a whole. These codes are quite different among organizations, being affected by their status -- supreme, as in the case of governments or churches -- or subsidiary, subordinate, dependent; and by their purposes -- educational, industrial, commercial political party, fraternal, governmental, religious, etc.; and by their technologies.³

Each member of the building committee was attuned to the codes of his respective employer, but at best he or she had only a vague conceptual code of what to expect from the church officials. As Chester Barnard has noted⁴ corporation executives create moral codes, increasing the complexity of corporate life,

which may within reason appear to be dictated by the good of the organization as a whole will obviously be counter to nearly all other codes, personal or official The code . . . is one which derives from a sense of the good of the organization as a whole⁵

The ethical code of the business corporation is one which considers the good of the "organization as a whole." It

³Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 273.

⁴Ibid., p. 274.

⁵Ibid., p. 277

appears that herein arose the conflict described in the previous pages. "The corporation as whole" for the members of the building committee was the local church, but for the members of the District Board of Building and Location "the corporation as a whole" was the Conference. Both sought to be good business people for the good of their respective organizations. There is a sense in which the business ethic described by Barnard above is situational. In a given situation the corporation will decide what is in the best interests of the institution, not the persons within the institution. Christian situation ethics, which has been largely attached to the name of Joseph Fletcher, approaches all ethical questions from the viewpoint of persons.

Situation Ethics

Situation ethics put plainly says

that you can't lay down in advance absolutes of right and wrong for all occasions, and then fit persons to them⁶ Persons are more important than principles.⁶

Fletcher has illustrated from a dialogue between business students and divinity students at Harvard how the business oriented persons expected the theologically oriented people to be rigid, moralistic, and letting the chips fall where they may, but instead they asked questions and failed "to

⁶John A.T. Robinson, But That I Can't Believe (New York: New American Library, 1967), p. 77.

behave according to the image of moralism that was a part of the businessmen's own conceptual apparatus."⁷ The theological students appeared to deny all moral codes and to subordinate law to love by inquiring

what in the situation is the most constructive decision to make, as measured by primary concern for people, and not for profits alone nor only for one's company's sake?⁸

These students were living thirty years after Barnard's writing of The Functions of the Executive in which he listed religious institutions among those that exist for the benefit of the organization rather than the individual. Generalizations have their weaknesses, but it may be possible that the business people of the building committee in Valencia "put the District Board of Building and Location in the same box" as did the Harvard business students and heard rigid moralisms and rules when such was not the intent of the district board. However, it may be argued that the district board was constituted of persons who had been formally educated prior to the advent of situation ethics. Further, their role was to protect the interests of the annual Conference. In analyzing the dynamics of decision-making, it appears that the expected roles were reversed. The district board asked, "What is good for the institution, that is, the annual Conference?" While the building

⁷Fletcher, p. 167.

⁸Ibid.

committee was asking, "In this situation what is the most constructive decision to make, as measured by a primary concern for the people?" This reversal of roles may be explained on two planes: (1) the District Board represented a larger body to which it felt ultimate responsibility, and (2) the men on the Board tended to be of more mature years than the members of the building committee.

In contrast to the members of the District Board the building committee had been exposed for at least three years to the preaching of recent seminary graduates, who were open to situation ethics. Thus, it appears in retrospect that in decision after decision the building committee was governed by situation ethics, while the District Board was governed in its decisions by business ethics. In almost all of the conflicts regarding building design (multipurpose versus traditional) between the local church and the district and Conference it can be seen that the building committee was seeking the best possible solution to the needs of the congregation in view of its situation.

A case may be made for the existence of the equality of intelligence and information for ethical decision-making in the minds of the local church leadership and the Conference officials in financing, planning and building. The members of the building committee had had experience in supervising the construction of buildings

in excess in value of the gross value of all the holdings of the Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church⁹. The pastor had more years of formal education and more years of pastoral experience than either of his superintendents. In a pyramidal, militaristic organizational structure these facts would probably be ignored, but in a biological conception of management, to borrow terminology from Drucker, consideration should be given to expertise of the hands in the field and the "leg men," who ultimately carry out the designs of the hierarchy. Wayne Oates has spoken of this issue.

The ability of superiors to learn from subordinates calls for decisions many superiors have not yet made, much less acted upon.

This can be applied to the ecclesiastical problems of religious decision making at the corporate level of the churches, denominations, hierarchies, and so on When role and office as status are split from functional responsibility in making decisions within the time limits available, then either chaos, insubordination, or tactful manipulation of superiors by subordinates -- or all three -- become the order of the day in a religious fellowship.¹⁰

Indeed the Valencia building committee resorted to insubordination and tactful manipulation out of what it viewed as necessity.

From the time of the first meeting of the building committee with the District Board of Building and Location

⁹Based on the 1975 Conference Journal, p. 523

¹⁰Wayne E. Oates, The Psychology of Religion (Waco, Tx.: Word Books, 1973), p. 200.

to the more recent meetings with Kirkman and Galvan, Conference officials were prone to lay out the rules of the Conference. In contrast the building committee members repeatedly reminded the Conference personnel of the first minister sent to the church, a reformed criminal, who had spent four years in prison before attending seminary and being admitted to the Conference membership, and who then slipped back into a life of crime while in Valencia. "Look at the situation, you of the Conference have put us in," was their complaint. It was deemed incumbent upon the Conference to bend the rules for Valencia because of poor judgement in appointing the first pastor. Likewise the Conference was faulted for sending an unseasoned minister when the second pastor was appointed. Due to these situations it was frequently lamented that the Conference must suspend some of its rules in order to permit the construction of a first unit. It is conceivable that an equally valid line of reasoning can be established in the opposite direction.

It may be argued that the building committee viewed the good of its own institution above the welfare of the Conference, and insisted that what was good for the local church must take precedence over Conference rules. Possibly the Conference officials saw Valencia as a "graveyard for ministers," since two had left the ministry from there in two and one-half years. Heaton was a recent transfer into the Conference from the South Indiana Conference. Could it

be that the situation in Valencia from the Conference viewpoint demanded that no exceptions be made to Conference rules? Such a consideration has little foundation, especially when one considers the number of Conference persons involved in leadership and the various plans put forth by each.

Possible Solution to the Question of Ethical Systems

Only those who were in the inner circles of the Conference and present at building committee meetings could know the motivations for actions taken. The building committee systematically sought the guidance of the congregation in planning. Primary concern was for the interests of the people. Within the Conference structure it appears Hinshaw and Hildebrand were willing to bend Conference rules for the good of the Valencia church. Even Williams must surely have known that nowhere near 20% of the required cash was on hand for construction as required by Conference rules. Kirkman appeared to acknowledge that for the good of the church the Conference must bend its rules without a formal vote of the annual Conference. To date Galvan has made no commitment publicly to any course of action in seeking to solve the financial need of the Valencia church, but he like all others, building committee, district board and Conference treasurer had pledged to do all within his ability to find funding.

The so-called business ethic and situation ethics must give way to a new synthesis, which would incorporate

several elements. (1) responsible action is always to be guided by the radical requirements of the overarching norm of love. This carries persons beyond self-interest to altruistic concern. (2) Within the limitations of a realistic world the closest possible approximation to love calls for varying responses in significantly differing situations. This requires flexibility in the application of rules in order that the welfare of persons may be given priority. (3) While the fullest possible autonomy is to be given to local groups, the welfare of persons in the larger organization has a prior claim over the more limited interest of local groups. (4) Moral action requires both responsibility for past action and for future consequences. In his latest work Cobb has touched on this.

Christian ethics requires that the person in the present moment accept full responsibility for past actions and commitments on the one side and be able to make trustworthy promises of future actions.¹¹

Ethics for church construction as well as all other deeds must consider not only what is good for the total organization to which one belongs, and what is good for the persons in the present situation, but ethics must also consider future consequences. "Ethics always has a future as well as a present reference."¹² Let us never forget that "moral choices need intelligence as much as they need concern,

¹¹John B. Cobb, Jr., Christ in a Pluralistic Age (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), p. 213.

¹²Daniel Day Williams, The Spirit and the Forms of Love (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 252.

sound information as well as good disposition."¹³

This chapter has sought to indicate the reversal of expected ethical roles between business managers in the local church and ministers on the district board, and to point out the need for a new ethic synthesizing the business ethic with situation ethics. The next chapter will analyze management principles as they came to play in the construction of the new church in Valencia.

¹³Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 114.

Chapter 7

MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH CONSTRUCTION

The fact "that the average minister devotes fifty per cent of his time to organizational and administrative duties"¹ bears out the corollary fact that the minister should be an effective manager in normal times. Add to the administrative responsibilities the establishment of a new institution and the construction of a new facility for worship and education, and it becomes increasingly apparent that the pastor of a mission church needs all the support he can gain from business management principles. There are four basic traditional principles of organization that speak to the administrative needs of the local church. One authority claims that "the business practices of the church financial office are, on the average, about the same in their efficiency as those . . . of the small commercial institution."² The traditional principles of organization can be applied to most churches.³ Attention is now directed to these principles.

¹Robert K. Bower, Administering Christian Education (Grand Rapids: Eermans, 1964), p. 15.

²William Ward Watkins, Planning and Building the Modern Church (New York: Dodge, 1951), p. 142

³The more authoritarian the theology the more business principles can be applied to churches.

Unity of Command

The first principle of organization advocates that "no member of an organization should report to more than one superior."⁴ In theory the United Methodist pastor is answerable only to the bishop, but in the case under consideration many apparent superiors imposed themselves on his autonomy. By virtue of ordination they were his peers, but in their respective functions they indeed gave the impression of being superiors. Included in this group would be the following: the district superintendent, the executive-secretary of the Board of Missions, the executive-secretary of the National Board of Global Ministries, the Chairman of the District Board of Building and Location, and the Conference treasurer. The list would not be complete without at least a passing mention of the local church building committee, the local church administrative board, and Charge Conference, and on and on the list could grow. To whom does the pastor answer? To everyone, if he is not careful. The minister of the United Methodist Church of Valencia frequently reviewed his sense of responsibility and constantly concluded that he was ultimately answerable only to the bishop and God. At no time to his knowledge had the bishop questioned his loyalty to the church, commitment to the ministry or business judgements. On one

⁴W. Warren Haynes and Joseph L. Massie, Management Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961), p. 39

occasion the bishop sent a young man from Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena to him to show the young fellow how United Methodists went about constructing new churches.⁵

Obviously there were agonizing hours when the pastor felt he must be responsible to everyone in the church and in the Conference. In more reflective moments he viewed himself as an autocratic manager, assuming the role out of necessity, not desire, and for the good of the congregation. It was not a comfortable role.

How does one go about the organization of an institution? . . . There seems to be little doubt about the necessity of beginning at the top level when a new organization is being established, since top-level personnel usually provide the plans and directions for those who are, or will be, part of the organization. Without sufficient leadership from the top, a new organization will lack coordination and the necessary stability for successful operation.⁶

Somewhat like John Wesley, founder of Methodism, the pastor assumed " . . . an authoritarian temper . . . ,"⁷ but in this case it was born out of necessity. Within a year of his arrival in Valencia church membership had doubled, and in view of this success the congregation tended to offer the minister more autonomy than he otherwise would have enjoyed. Circumstances determine strategy.

⁵Yes, it was an ego trip, but the date and the name of the Fuller student escape recollection.

⁶Bower, p. 42.

⁷Albert Outler, Evangelism in the Wesleyan Spirit (Nashville: Tidings, 1971), p. 18.

Sometimes the intuitive style of a manager leads him to adopt . . . a strategy in a crisis situation and thus to bring about a major change in a relatively short space of time.⁸

The Valencia pastor believed he lived in a crisis situation from the day he arrived in Valencia. He had been told that Conference support would be terminated within six months, and so once the course to build was set, he viewed himself as a manager in every sense of the word.

Under the authority of the bishop and in relation to Conference officials the pastor saw himself as an equal among equals and was determined not to be deterred from his course of action once it bore the stamp of approval of the building committee in Valencia, the representatives of the people, who eventually would have to pay for whatever was constructed. A "proper church" would be built. The members of the District Board of Building and Location had pointed to church after church that had failed or was failing. It was the pastor's judgment that in most cases these failing churches had never enjoyed adequate facilities from their inception, and they were destined to failure. Indeed he saw himself as being ultimately accountable to "no more than one superior," the bishop. The Conference staff was viewed as fellow supporters in ministry, brothers in Christ, to be called upon in time of need. In relation to the building committee he began to adjust his thinking

⁸Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 132.

to the notion that he must serve as a manager in cooperation with the chairman. Thus, there were those who must answer to him, if a functioning organization was to be obtained.

Span of Control

The second principle of organization is known as span of control, that is,

there is a limit to the number of subordinates that should report to one superior Five to eight people are the maximum number one man can supervise.⁹

Where in the United Methodist Church does this concept of span of control exist? The bishop supervises ten district superintendents. The superintendents have supervision of fifty to sixty pastors. The ratio of pastors to laity is about one to three hundred. In the local churches almost every committee and board has nine or more members. The building committee had twelve members.

As soon as a man begins to work directly with a large number of persons he reduces his effectiveness. All factors being equal, it is far easier to work with three persons than with twenty.¹⁰

In retrospect the pastor would not again select a building committee as large as the one chosen. Of the twelve members seldom did all attend every meeting. It may be that their absences were caused in part by inefficient use of manpower -- too many people for a normal span of control,

⁹Haynes and Massie, p. 41

¹⁰Bower, p. 43.

or to feel the intimacy of being needed.

Supervision of too many people can lead to trouble. The superior will not have time to devote to any one subordinate to do an adequate job of supervision. He may be distracted by a large number of contacts required in his position so that he neglects the important questions of policy.¹¹

Reflecting now on the course of construction, the minister sees that his span of control was much less than twelve when functioning relationships are reviewed.

Objectively considered (and stated at the risk of being faulted for showing favoritism, an unpardonable ministerial sin) there were four functionaries who stood out above the rest in terms of time spent with them by the pastor. These persons were Cravener, Harris, Moore, and Jones. Cravener coordinated communications with the building committee and Conference officials when Heaton felt he could not function comfortably and effectively. Harris was always the indispensable, ever-available, architectural consultant. Extremely well self-motivated, Moore ran his own department, the heating and air-conditioning installation. Jones not only oversaw the electrical work, but frequently served as Heaton's confessor. Jones had just completed a \$1.6 billion test laboratory for General Motors, and in most brotherly manner shared again and again from his decision-making processes in relationship to his home office in Detroit and the

¹¹Haynes and Massie, p. 41

general and subcontractors in California. Explanations of cost over-runs, inflation, company power politics between departments, and a host of other useful tools of communication came from Jones. He closely identified with the pastor's role in accountability to the bishop, the district superintendent, and the congregation. In General Motors these persons have their parallels in the president, the vice-president of engineering, and the employees in the plant. What was good for General Motors was good for the United Methodist Church of Valencia. Jones "gave guts to the pastor when his own failed him."

The above relationships are indicated only to reveal the principle of span of control that arose without conscious effort on the part of anyone in the organization. As the construction phase progressed other equally intimate relationships arose as these diminished of necessity. Time had to be given to other projects -- landscaping, cabinets and seating to name but a few. The irrigation system was installed under the direct supervision of David Mastroleo. Dave's span of control appears to have extended to Woody Woodruff, who came to church more faithfully at eight o'clock on Saturday mornings than most members do on Sunday mornings, Lee Skidmore, Ron Klein, and Harriet Thompson, who personally raked more rocks from the Valencia church lawn than all the rest of the members combined.

Another span of control that existed under the

pastor's prodding was the pew renovation crew, consisting of Herb Ellingson, Ken Craig, and Forest Casterline. While it was not apparent to the minister during the planning and construction phases of the church it is now clear to him that he functions best when his span of control is three or four. In the normal functioning of the church his dependence tends to be upon the chairpersons of the finance committee, the administrative board, and the council of ministries, as well, of course, the lay leader. Another principle of organization to be considered is called the "exception principle."

The Exception Principle

This principle suggests that "decisions which occur frequently should be reduced to a routine and delegated to subordinates."¹² No wise pastor will refer to anyone directly as his subordinate; however, on organization charts there must be managers and subordinates. The writer frequently advises his parishoners and committees that he views himself as a playing coach in the mission of the church. This is not to dodge responsibility but to relate better to all participants in an all volunteer organization. But in actuality who are the minister's subordinates?

Potentially the minister's subordinates may be all with whom he comes in contact. In practice every committee in the church is his subordinate. During the three years

¹²Ibid.

covered by this present study the writer has found many who were willing to serve in subordinate roles as a part of their Christian ministry within the concept of the priesthood of all believers. The counting of collections, the seating of worshipers, the payment of bills, the maintenance of buildings, the education of children and youth, along with many, many other functions are in a sense routine and must be delegated to subordinates if the pastor is to function as preacher and counselor.

In the construction of the church in Valencia those already mentioned under span of control volunteered to serve in subordinate roles within the organization of the church. Jones, the General Motors manager, became an electrical consultant and installer. Cravener, the corporate vice-president, served as administrative assistant to the pastor in dealing with the local church as well as Conference leaders. He was able to apply pressure successfully to gain results which the minister could not have done. Indeed the leader of the Valencia United Methodist Church had very effective subordinates. A final organizational principle to be considered is called, "the scalar principle."

The Scalar Principle

The scalar principle means "simply that every undertaking should have some kind of hierarchy involving

superiority-subordinate relationships."¹³ This principle was especially evident in the volunteer labor program of the church. Often the skilled laborers became the supervisors of corporate managers in order to perform construction tasks. The craftsmen became chiefs-for-a-day. A navy skipper served as a hod carrier for the stone crew.¹⁴ Men who spent their week days hopping jets across the nation for national and international corporations, often spent their week-ends as manual laborers.

In view of the fact that the building committee functioned more by consensus than by Robert's Rules the formal structure tended to be also the informal structure so that the superiority-subordinate roles were aparent. In contrast within the Annual Conference the informal structure of the scalar principle seemed to obtain. Williams and Kirkman, the two Conference treasurers, gave evidence of more authority than the district superintendents. The obvious reason for this is that the Conference treasurer in theory may retain his position for life, but the superintendent must be moved at the end of a six year period. Further the treasurers' responsibility is purely fiscal where as the superintendent is also vested with appointment powers. Consequently the superintendents have more

¹³Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁴Commander Dr. Richard Schuerger, U.S.N.

responsibility to the pastors than do the treasurers. The treasurer is accountable to the Annual Conference alone. A summary of the four principles in an organization is now reviewed.

Summary of Traditional Organizational Principles

Organizational principles of secular business management indeed do apply to the church, whether purposefully planned or accidentally achieved. The church is a business but a different kind of business. ". . . The church . . . is the only institution in society that is in the business primarily to deal with moral and spiritual issues."¹⁵ As such it is dependent upon volunteer subordinates who must be treated as colleagues, fellow pilgrims, equals, and even superiors at times when their respective wealth, education, and achievements are considered. By what manner then does the pastor achieve his managerial authority?

Pastoral Authority

The assets of the minister that make for his success also contribute to his control over his parishoners.

¹⁵Norman J. Faramelli, Technethics (New York: Friendship Press, 1971), p. 145.

The fact that he represents spiritual power and is a potential source of strength for satisfying human longings increases his potential for controlling lives.¹⁶

His power is unlike that in any other business. "His authority is derived, mediated, as well as immediate and personal."¹⁷ His institution defies complete classification according to absolute organizational theories. The church is unique as a temple and the mosque. Pastoral authority is unique. The religious leader

knows that his life is his only power, and he puts it at stake constantly. By the simple law of probabilities, if he goes on raising his voice and risking his life, he is finally going to strike the right note

. . . Nor can he attempt to build an exclusively prophetic Church . . . , but he has to go on with his non-conformist or revolutionary vocation. . . . He has to maintain loyalty to the structures. . . .¹⁸

that is, the structures that are thrust upon him. His authority, although perhaps nebulous by business management theories is real, if he takes his calling seriously, and his followers accept his leadership. When his life fails to measure up to his teaching and his deeds do not correspond to his doctrine his authority soon erodes. Attention has been given to the main organizational theories of business management in the foregoing. Mention will now be made of the various schools of business management and

¹⁶C.W. Brister, Pastoral Care in the Church (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 134.

¹⁷Samuel Southard, Pastoral Authority in Personal Relationships (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), p. 139.

¹⁸Raimundo Pannikar, Worship and Secular Man (Marynoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 26.

their relationship to church leadership.

Schools of Business Management

Passing comment is made here on the main schools of thinking on business management and consideration is given to their relationship to the church.

Classical School, or "Scientific Management"

"Any discussion of the history of management thoughts starts with the 'scientific management' movement. . . ." ¹⁹ Also known as the classical school, the writers in this endeavor were concerned with (1) the elimination of waste, (2) fitting workers to particular tasks, (3) training workers for their respective jobs, (4) defining management activities and details of operation, and (5) "the establishment of standards for performance." ²⁰ Wage motivation was the main incentive of this school of thinking, and therefore, at least formally considered, this school of thinking will have little to offer the church. Informally considerable credit is given in this present work throughout the foregoing pages to such incentive in the life of the church. The real "crunch comes at the

¹⁹Haynes and Massie, p. 3.

²⁰Ibid., p. 4.

point of motivation" ²¹ Money does not move all men or women to more effective production. A casual examination of the Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church may leave the impression that the classical school of management should be found in the church due to its pyrimidic structure, but in actuality it does not. A second school of theory developed in the 1930's was known as the human relations movement.

The Human Relations School

Making people happy at work and teaching people how to get along with people was the thrust of this school. It has been accused of too much dependence on manipulation. It postulated that "communication can solve any problem." ²² There were times when the pastor felt that some of his ministerial superiors had bought too deeply into this theory of management. ²³ For the church happiness is not an ultimate goal but may be a side benefit of godly living.

In relationship to the District Board of Building and Location the local church building committee may rightly be charged with employment of human relations theory to get across their presentation for the need and methods

²¹ Statement by Robert Arnott, lecture at Sherman Oaks United Methodist Church, Sherman Oaks, California February 2, 1976.

²² Ibid.

²³ See p. 112

of construction of a new church in Valencia.²⁴ A third school of thinking in management is known as structuralism or the application of the behavioral sciences to management.

Structuralism

Basically stated this theory holds that "in any organization one must come to terms with groups that have power and must be negotiated with."²⁵ Group dynamics and democratic process became the terms of structuralism.

. . . Groups, in which there was active member participation in decisions, were more productive both of human satisfaction and of achievement of the group objective.²⁶ Thus, they came to stress group participation.

Structuralism offers many insights into the operation of the church both at the Conference and the local level. At issue is apparent power and actual power. One of the frustrations of the building committee in Valencia after the election of a new bishop, appointment of a new superintendent and treasurer of the Conference was the actual location of real power. It is now viewed to reside in the treasurer and the bishop. Another possible argument may be developed to suggest that the real base of power in the church is the local church. Without the support of the

²⁴See p. 127.

²⁵Arnott.

²⁶Haynes and Massie, p. 8.

parishoners there could be no institutionalization of the church as Methodism now knows it. Thus, the membership must be negotiated with and convinced of the validity of the mission of the church and the necessity of disciplined support. Indeed, structuralism offers much insight into the functioning of the institutional church. If the bishop and the local congregation may be viewed as the sources of real power, then of necessity the pastor is the negotiator, unless of course, he is able to employ lay persons or Conference personnel in the process. Frequently in the construction of the United Methodist Church of Valencia Cravener and the building committee served as negotiators for the local church, while the district superintendent, the Conference treasurer and the District Board of Building and Location served the interests of the Conference. A fourth and more promising view of management is to be found in the systems theory, an eclectic approach, that lends itself best to analyzing the church.

The Systems Theory

In the systems theory we find an approach in which the entire company may be viewed as a single operating system with inputs and outputs and in which the elements must be highly logical.²⁷

²⁷Auren Uris, Mastery of Management (Chicago: Playboy Press, 1968), p. 30.

"The systems theory is the basket that holds all the observations from one life science to another."²⁸ For United Methodists the inputs are obvious, but the outputs are up for grabs. In the Systems Theory approach "we decide . . . what end use we want and then choose or fashion the material we want to use."²⁹ End use varies. Some want saved souls. Others desire integrated personalities. These issues never arose in the building committee meetings of the United Methodist Church of Valencia. The end use was a "proper" church, and systems were established by which it became a reality. Management by objectives obtained.

The interest and investment of the Conference was determined to be significant. The embarrassment of the Conference over not building a church on land it had owned for five years was assessed and found to be real. Hinshaw and Hildebrand had supervised the purchase of the land. Hinshaw would be returning to the pastorate by no later than June, 1974, and Hildebrand would retire in June, 1975. The death of Greenlee had challenged many local people to take up the task from which he had been removed by death. The new bishop appeared to be more concerned for changing the structures of the church and intercity missions than for

²⁸Arnott.

²⁹Peter F. Drucker, Technology, Management and Society, (London: Chaucer Press, 1970), p. 72

suburban church growth at that point in time. In January of 1973 the building committee systematically plotted to break ground for a new church before Hinshaw's reassignment in June, 1974. On June 2, 1974 ground was broken with Hinshaw and Hildebrand in attendance. Their plan was coming to fruition for the land they had purchased, but much more than that the United Methodists in Valencia were getting the church building they had dreamed of for some six years. A network of processes were established in which all the parts were seen as having a greater potential whole than any of them alone. "Living systems tend to maintain balance."³⁰ Thus, the Conference could be depended upon to pursue the establishment of a church in Valencia after failing with two previous pastors. Fortunately the Conference was not living by the business practices of modern society in which Drucker has advised "If at first you don't succeed, try once more -- and then try something else."³¹ It is suspected that the initial state of mind of the superintendent and executive-secretary was well identified by the building committee. Years of business practice told them that "if an initial state can be identified, the final state can be predicted."³²

³⁰ Arnott.

³¹ Peter F. Drucker, Managing for Results (London: Pan Books, 1967), p. 79.

³² Arnott.

The systems analysts of the building committee PERT-charted their course of action and developed long-range plans³³ and achieved their desired end.

Local Church Errors in Planning, Financing and Construction

The question has been asked, "Did the local church or the local pastor make no errors of judgment, in planning, financing or construction." Several interviews have been conducted in an attempt to locate constructive criticism in this direction: "What did the church do wrong?"

Following are some responses.

The church erred in selecting a distant architect. His talents were excellent, but his manipulation of the committee to secure a more expensive design than desired, should have been detected, and a less expensive church could have been erected. However, no one locally is now displeased with the added expense of the heavy arches and beams that grace a very attractive building. Also, in relation to the architect, it is now conceded that his absense during supervision cost more than the one percent saved. Because he refused to give explanations to the builder, about \$5,000 worth of extra beams had to be included.

³³Drucker, Technology, Management and Society, p. 123 has defined long-range planning as "the continuous process of making present entrepreneurial (risk-taking) decisions systematically and with the best possible knowledge of their futurity, organizing systematically the efforts needed to carry out these decisions against the expectations through organized, systematic feedback."

It must be kept in mind that these are local church comments on the church's own errors. Allowing the Conference to purchase land, and then to gather a congregation with which to pay for the land was construed as being deceitful. The congregation feels it should not have allowed such a process to transpire. Further, from the perspective of investment one churchman has quipped that you don't put a \$20,000 house on a \$20,000 lot. You will more than likely put an \$80,000 house on a \$20,000 lot. Likewise, the church should have insisted from the beginning that the Conference think in terms of at least a \$400,000 expenditure for the first unit.

The foregoing adds little to the question, "What did the church do wrong during planning, financing and construction?" but it is the report of the survivors of the venture.

Indeed the practice of business management does have something to say to the Church after all! But the Church is more than a business. It must be a community of faith.

If the community of faith has a future -- and I think it has -- its hope lies not in the ecclesiastical institution, no matter how cleverly redesigned and updated. The hope lies in these seminal personalities who have the power to renew it.³⁴

³⁴Charles Merrill Smith, The Pearly Gates Syndicate or How to Sell Real Estate in Heaven (Garden City: Doubleday, 1971), pp. 217-218.

The members of the United Methodist Church of Valencia have been such "seminal personalities." May God's richest blessings be theirs always. Amen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anderson, Gerald H. (ed.) Theology of the Christian Mission. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Arnett, Dessie Ash, and Lenace Robinette Clark United Methodist Altars. 2d ed. Charleston: Harrett, 1970.
- Augenstein, Leroy. Come, Let Us Play God. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Barclay, William, Ethics in a Permissive Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Barnard, Chester I. Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- Berlo, David K. Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960.
- Berne, Eric. Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, 1964.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, Ethics. ed. Eberhard Bethge. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church. Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1968.
- Bower, Robert K. Administering Christian Education. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Brister, C.W. Pastoral Care in the Church. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Carlson, Martin E. Why People Give. New York: Council Press 1968.
- Chiles, Robert E. Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790 - 1935. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Cobb, John B., Jr. Christian Natural Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- . God and the World. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- . Christ in a Pluralistic Age. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Drucker, Peter F. Managing for Results. London: Pan Books, 1967.

- _____. Technology, Management and Society. London: Chaucer Press, 1970.
- Edwards, K. Morgan. Hoping to Be Somebody. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959.
- Ellul, Jacques. The New Demons. tr. C. Edward Hopkin, New York: Seabury Press, 1975.
- Engstrom, Ted W., and R. Alec MacKenzie. Managing Your Time. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
- Faramelli, Norman J. Technethics. New York: Friendship Press, 1971.
- Fletcher, Joseph. Situation Ethics. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- _____. Moral Responsibility. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Gilkey, Langdon. Religion and the Scientific Future. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Gray, Gary M., and Allen D. Mitchell. The Prophet's Dollar. New York: Exposition Press, 1971.
- Harmon, Nolan B. Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1928.
- Haynes, W. Warren, and Joseph L. Massie. Management Analysis, Concepts and Cases. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Holck, Manfred, Jr., Making It on a Pastor's Salary. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974.
- Johnson, Douglas W., and George W. Cornell. Punctured Preconceptions. New York: Friendship Press, 1972.
- Jones, Tracey K., Jr. Our Mission Today. New York: World Outlook Press, 1963.
- Kennedy, Gerald. For Laymen and Other Martyrs. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Küng, Hans. The Church. tr. Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- Marnell, William H. The Good Life of Western Man. New York: Herder & Herder, 1971.
- Martin, Malachi. Three Popes and the Cardinal. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1972.

- Marty, Martin E. The Fire We Can Light. Garden City: Doubleday, 1973.
- Maslow, Abraham H. Toward a Psychology of Being. 2d ed. New York: Van Nostrand, 1968.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Professional Manager. Ed. Warren G. Bennis and Caroline McGregor. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Menninger, Karl. Whatever Became of Sin. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973.
- Miller, Donald G. Nature and Mission of the Church. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1957.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. Theology of Hope. tr. James W. Leitch. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- . Hope and Planning. tr. Margaret Clarkson. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- . The Crucified God. tr. R.A. Wilson and John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- . The Experiment of Hope. tr. M. Douglas Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold, Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic. Cleveland: World, 1957.
- . Essays in Applied Christianity, The Church and the World. Ed. D. B. Robertson. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Oates, Wayne E. Psychology of Religion. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1973.
- O'Connor, Flannery. Three: Wise Blood, A Good Man Is Hard to Find, The Violent Bear It Away. New York: New American Library, n.d.
- Outler, Albert. Evangelism and the Wesleyan Spirit, Nashville: Tidings, 1971.
- Packard, Vance. Nation of Strangers. New York: Pocket Books, 1974.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Theology and the Kingdom of God. Ed. Richard John Neuhaus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Pannikar, Raimundo. Worship and the Secular Man. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1973.

- Pastor X. How to Murder a Minister. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1970
- Peter, Laurence J., and Raymond Hull. The Peter Principle. New York: Morrow, 1969.
- Pike, James A. A Time for Christian Candor. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- _____. You and the New Morality. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Roberts, Oral. The Miracle of Seed Faith Tulsa: Oral Roberts, 1970.
- Robinson, John A.T. But That I Can't Believe. New York: New America Library, 1967.
- Ruether, Rosemary. Liberation Theology. New York: Paulist Press, 1972.
- Scaduto, Anthony. Handling Your Money. New York: McKay, 1963.
- Sherwin, Oscar John Wesley, Friend of the People. New York: Twayne, 1961.
- Shippey, Frederick A. Protestantism in the Suburbs. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Smith, Charles Merrill. Pearly Gates Syndicate or How to Sell Real Estate in Heaven. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Southard, Samuel. Pastoral Authority in Personal Relationships. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.
- Strom, Robert C. (ed.) Behold a New Thing. New York: Board of National Missions, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1965.
- Tuell, Jack M. Organization of the United Methodist Church. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Uris, Auren. Mastery of Management. Chicago: Playboy Press, 1968.
- Vaux, Kenneth. Subduing the Cosmos: Cynbernetics and Man's Future. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1970.
- Watkins, William Ward. Planning and Building the Modern Church. New York: Dodge, 1951.
- Williams, Daniel Day. The Spirit and the Forms of Love. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches. Nashville:
Abingdon Press, 1973.

Periodicals

"Criticisms Unfounded; 'It's Alive and Well,' Say National Division Officials," United Methodist Reporter, August 8, 1975, p. 13

"New Church Development Needs to Be 'Full Time' of U.M.C.," United Methodist Reporter, August 8, 1975, p. 2.

"New Models for Church Extension," Circuit West, January 2, 1976, p. 1.

"Pastor Starting New Church Doesn't Find Any Answers," United Methodist Reporter, August 8, 1975, p. 3.

Schaller, Lyle E. "Your're in Top 20 Percent With 150 Regulars at Worship," Christian Advocate, Feb. 15, 1973, pp. 16-17.

"We Can't Go On Like This -- It's a Sick Joke, Claim Two Former Officials," United Methodist Reporter, August 8, 1975, p. 3.

Journals

Southern California-Arizona Annual Conference, The United Methodist Church. Journal, 1967, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975.

Interviews

Andrus, Darwin, Personal Interview. September 28, 1973

Brooks, Richard. Personal Interview. n.d.

Cravener, Donald H., Jr. Personal Interview. February 28, 1976.

_____. Personal Interview. n.d.

_____, Edith Walters and David Mastroleo. Personal Interview. n.d.

Greenlee, Raymond V. Personal Interview. n.d.

Hildebrand, Will. Personal Interview. n.d.

Hinshaw, Lawrence A. Personal Interview. January 24, 1973.

_____. Personal Interview. December 19, 1973.

_____. Personal Interview. n.d.

Johnson, Richmond. Personal Interview. February 8, 1976.

Michaelson, Burton. Personal Interview. n.d.

Minter, Russell. Personal Interview. n.d.

Scharer, Fletcher. Personal Interview. n.d.

Small, William. Personal Interview. n.d.

Wallis, William. Personal Interview. n.d.

Williams, George. Personal Interview. July 31, 1974.

Minutes of Meetings

Santa Barbara District, United Methodist Church. District Board of Building and Location, Minutes, May 7, 1973.

Santa Barbara District, United Methodist Church. District Board of Building and Location, Minutes, December 15, 1974.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Building Committee, Minutes, May 22, 1973.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Building Committee, Minutes, August 12, 1975.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Board of Trustees, Minutes, August 9, 1973.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Board of Trustees, Minutes, December 10, 1975.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Charge Conference, Minutes, January 24, 1973.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Charge Conference, Minutes, December 29, 1974.

United Methodist Church of Valencia. Council on Ministries, Minutes, March 6, 1972.

Letters

Andrus, Darwin, and Donald H. Cravener, Jr., January 3, 1974.

Andrus, Darwin, and the writer, October 19, 1973.

_____. January 3, 1974.

_____. January 9, 1974.

_____. January 17, 1974.

_____. February 14, 1974.

Bruhn, Charles, and the Members of the United Methodist
Church of Valencia, November 2, 1973.

Gould, John C., and the writer, March 2, 1973.

Hildebrand, Will, and Lawrence A. Hinshaw, May 15, 1969.

Hildebrand, Will, and the writer, April 28, 1973.

Hinshaw, Lawrence A., and Peter Kremer, October 11, 1968.

_____. October 29, 1968.

_____. November 4, 1968.

_____. May 19, 1969.

Hinshaw, Lawrence A., and Fletcher Scharer, May 19, 1969.

_____. July 2, 1969.

Hinshaw, Lawrence A., and George Williams, July 3, 1969.

Jordan, Thatcher, and Peter Kremer, December 28, 1967.

_____. April 25, 1968.

Randles, Anthony, and Will Hildebrand, February 10, 1969.

Santa Clarita Valley Escrow Company, and the Trustees of the
United Methodist Church of Valencia, October 24, 1975.

Taylor, David and J. Wesley Hole, August 6, 1969.

Toney, Edward and George F. Williams, April 2, 1969.

Van Cleave, Charles and George F. Williams, August 11, 1969.

- Williams, George F., and David Taylor, June 12, 1969.
- _____. November 30, 1969.
- _____. March 1, 1971.
- _____. July 24, 1971.
- _____. November 30, 1971.
- _____. January 25, 1972.
- _____, and Tonia Henson, September 18, 1969.
- _____, and the writer, April 30, 1973.
- _____. December 17, 1973.
- _____. July 26, 1974.
- _____. November 21, 1974.
- _____. January 22, 1975.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

MEMORIAL SERVICE

for

RAYMOND V. GREENLEE, 1938-1972

December 9, 1972

THE ORGAN PRELUDE

Mrs. Norma Long

O God, Our Help in Ages Past

Still, Still, with Thee

My Faith Looks Up to Thee

Lead, Kindly Light

THE SCRIPTURE SENTENCES

John 11:25-26, Deut. 33:27a, II Corinth. 5:1

HYMN #77

Praise, My Soul, the King

THE CALL TO WORSHIP

ldr: The Lord is my light and my salvation;

cgn: Whom shall I fear?

ldr: The Lord is the stronghold of my life;

cgn: Of whom shall I be afraid? Amen.

THE COLLECT

all uniting

God of the hills, our Guide on the upward climb, give us vision and strength for our journey through life. When the trail becomes faint, and mist hides the summit, wilt Thou show us the way? When the path is rough with sharp stones, as it winds around the jagged cliffs, wilt Thou take our hands and lead us? And when near the summit, with the deep chasms dropping abruptly on either side,

wilt Thou keep our steps firm and sure? Then at the end of our journey, wilt thou bring healing to our bruised feet, and rest for our tired muscles, and may we hear thy voice say, "Well done, you have reached the summit of the hills of God." Amen.

THE SILENT PRAYER

THE LORD'S PRAYER all uniting

THE PSALTER Psalm 23, Psalm 90

THE GLORIA PATRI all uniting

THE NEW TESTAMENT Romans 8, Ephesians 3:14-21

THE PASTORAL PRAYER

HYMN #12 Joyful, Joyful, We Adore Thee

THE WORDS OF TRIBUTE AND ASSURANCE

The Reverend Doctor Fred A. Brossmer, former minister

The Reverend Kenneth G. Heaton, present minister

HYMN (inside front cover of hymnal) How Great Thou Art

THE CLOSING PRAYER

THE BENEDICTION

THE POSTLUDE

The Battle Hymn of the Republic

Lead On, O King Eternal

God of Grace and God of Glory

IN MEMORIAM

RAYMOND VERNON GREENLEE

March 6, 1938 - December 7, 1972

Ray was born in Marshall, Illinois, the eldest son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Greenlee. He was a graduate of Trinity College in Connecticut. He was elected "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" in 1969 by the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce. About three years ago he came to California as associate auditor of the western home office of the Prudential Insurance Company of America. He is survived by his wife, Ginny, his sons, Ray, Jeff and Mike, his parents, two brothers and three sisters. Raymond Greenlee was a loyal servant of God, serving as liturgist, associate lay leader, chairman of evangelism, chairman of stewardship, and a member of the finance committee. The funeral service will be held at the Moore Funeral Home, Marshall, Illinois, Monday, December 11. Internment will be in the family plot at Marshall. The Reverend Robert Beasley of the United Methodist Church, Marshall, will officiate. Mrs. Greenlee, Ray, Jeff, and Mike have requested that in lieu of flowers, donations be made to the building fund of the United Methodist Church of Valencia. A permanent, memorial marker will be installed in the church building when it is completed.

WORDS OF TRIBUTE AND ASSURANCE

by

The Reverend Kenneth G. Heaton

Let me tell you about my friendship with Raymond Greenlee. I was introduced to him by way of a business card, just two months ago, but it seems like twenty years ago. Reverend Lawrence A. Hinshaw, my district superintendent, met with me late one Sunday evening to discuss my coming to Valencia. He gave me Ray's calling card on which he had written, "a great Layman," and he said, "He's a man you've got to meet."

The next morning I called Ray's office and learned that he was out of town for a few days, so I called the Greenlee residence in Valencia. As a result of that call, I attended a hastily called Pastor-Parish Relation's Committee meeting to see for myself what the lay people of the Valencia Methodist Church really looked like, and to be honest with you, to determine whether they could accept me as their pastor. We met without the knowledge or the blessing of the bishop, which is bad politics for church and minister always! Ray was working in Pomona that week, but when advised of a meeting with a possible pastor for his church, he came home and met me in the parking lot of the county library. He was the first member of the United Methodist Church of Valencia that I met, and I was impressed.

My first Sunday in Valencia I was invited along with my family to the Greenlee home for dinner. That day

he gave me a "vital statistics" report of the church in writing, which he had prepared. Then hesitatingly he added, "I was afraid the church would fall apart without a pastor, and I just kind of took over. I had no right to do it, but I pushed my way in." As I know Ray I am sure I am safe in saying that when he pushed, he did it so gently that no one ever felt shoved.

When we had our first stewardship meeting to discuss ways of raising the next year's budget I came prepared to draw up plans for a "hard sell" campaign, strong in statistics. Along with Orren Harris, Ray had prepared four full pages of notes, single-spaced, detailing a complete program. The main thrust of the plan was summed up in Ray's own words, "We really want to convince people that they are giving to God and not just to the officers of the church."

Many of us were concerned to get our building program underway. Ray always insisted that we were not yet ready. Jokingly he said, "The way our members give we need at least a thousand members before we can build." But only his wife knew that he had set up a savings account at his work for the building of the church. His employer deducted money regularly from his pay check for the building of a church in Valencia.

Last Sunday morning when my wife and children arrived for worship she was upset because my daughter had soiled her shoes somewhere along the route. Jestingly Ray reminded Sylvia that she would have to change her frame of

mind before she could worship. A moment or two later he told me that he was not feeling well, but insisted that we continue with worship with the words, "It's nothing; I will be OK."

Parting words have always seemed important to people. None could be more prophetic than those uttered by Raymond Greenlee. Together we approached the altar. He turned to the lecturn, and added his own liturgy to what was already in the order for worship; with much enthusiasm he announced, "This is the day the Lord hath made. Let us be glad and rejoice in it." Clearly I recall thinking to myself, "Ray is doing a great job as liturgist; he appears more vibrant and radiant today than before." Together we sang

Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven
To his feet thy tribute bring;
Ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven,
Evermore his praises sing.
Alleluia! Alleluia!
Praise the everlasting King.

With the singing of that last line Ray was no longer in this life.

His departure was like that of the Old Testament saint, Enoch, who walked with God, and was not for God took him. I choose to believe that Ray crammed enough deeds of kindness and goodness into his short thirty-four years that God took him home for rest, because he had already done more than his share for God, the church and the community. He was a leader in Boy Scouts, a community swimming team, and the homeowner's association. Life was full for Ray. He loved and lived for others. In adversity he was always

undefeated. He returned to God just as he had lived -- on his feet and in the service of the Lord. Like Jesus before him temporal life was taken from him in his thirties. As people saw the eternal God in Jesus, so in Ray we learned how God works through the human spirit. All of us learned more about how to live better because we knew Ray Greenlee. His departure is clear call to all of us to get on with the task of building the kingdom of God on earth. Let us respond to Christ's call.

The pains of death are passed.
Labor and sorrows cease,
And Life's short warfare closed at last.
His soul is found in peace.
Soldier of Christ, well done.
Praise be thy new employ
And while eternal ages run,
Rest in thy Savior's joy. Amen and Amen.

APPENDIX B

CONGREGATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. How long have you been a United Methodist?

The average was sixteen years.

Less than one year -- 18%

One to four years -- 11%

Five to ten years -- 20%

More than ten years -- 51%

2. How many members were there in the church you came from?

More than 2,000 members -- 11%

1,500 to 2,000 members -- 13%

1,000 to 1,500 members -- 11%

700 to 1,000 members -- 13%

500 to 700 members -- 9%

300 to 500 members -- 16%

less than 300 members -- 27%

3. What was your average donation per week to your former church?

Average was \$4.76

4. What is your average weekly donation to this church?

Average was \$7.28, or an increase of 30%!

Less than \$1.00 per week -- 13%

Less than \$5.00 per week -- 22%

Less than \$10 per week -- 27%

Less than \$12 per week -- 18%

Less than \$25 per week -- 16%

Over \$25 per week -- 6%

5. What is your gross family income?
- Less than \$5,000 per year -- 10%
 - Less than \$7,500 per year -- 4%
 - Less than \$10,000 per year-- 8%
 - Less than \$15,000 per year-- 22%
 - Less than \$20,000 per year-- 35%
 - Less than \$25,000 per year-- 16%
 - Over \$25,000 per year -- 6%
6. In what age group are you?
- Under 25 years of age -- 6%
 - Under 40 years of age -- 48%
 - Under 65 years of age -- 39%
 - Over 65 years of age -- 7%
7. Did your former church have a "proper" sanctuary?
- 75% Yes
 - 25% No
8. Do you favor building a multipurpose building first?
- 17% Yes
 - 83% No
9. Do you favor building a smaller, but complete "proper" church first?
- 83% Yes
 - 17% No
10. Do you attend church every Sunday?
- 65% Yes
 - 35% No
11. Do you attend church every other Sunday? -- 29% Yes

12. Do you attend church once a month or less? -- 6% yes

13. Do you consider a choir of 15 people adequate for a chapel seating only 150?

61% Yes

28% No

11% No opinion

14. What type of seating do you favor?

76% permanent pews

15% movable pews

7% stacking chairs

2% folding chairs

APPENDIX C

INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR BUILDING¹

1. People will give only one hour per week to worship and church school; therefore, worship and church school must function simultaneously.
2. Worship and church school have about the same attendance.
3. A "proper" church is highly desired. Visually the building must say, "We are here to stay."
4. Church school classes must follow the following minimums:

<u>Group</u>	<u>Ideal size of group</u>	<u>Minimum sq. ft.</u>
Nursery	5	30 per pupil
Kindergarten	6	25
Grades one to four	8	12
Grades five to six	10	9
Junior high	12	8
Senior high and adult	25	8

The average square footage needed is 14.6; therefore, a minimum number of square feet for a church school of 150 pupils would be 2,490, plus restrooms, plus office, plus storage. The total minimum need for an education building is 3,000 square feet.

5. Minimum needs for a sanctuary for worship:
 - a. seating for 150 worshipers @ 8 sq. ft. per person-1200
 - b. chancel should equal 1/3 of area-- 400
 - c. narthex should equal chancel-- 400

¹Presented by Kenneth G. Heaton to first meeting of the building committee following its election Jan. 26, 1973.

d. three offices @ 150 square feet --	450
e. two restrooms @ 120 square feet --	<u>240</u>

Total square footage needed for worship area and offices -- 2,690

6. Total minimum square footage needed for worship and church school is 5,690.

7. Rationale for building to accomodate 150 people:

- a. We now average about half that attendance.
- b. We now have about 2 1/2% of the Valencia population enrolled in the membership of the church. National average for Methodists is 5%, so we should have twice as much space as we presently need.
- c. Only 20% of the United Methodist churches in America average over 150 in attendance weekly (See Christian Advocate, February 15, 1973).

- i. Friendly Valley United Methodist Church, our neighboring church, presently under construction seats 260 people. Square footage is 5,400 and final cost will be \$103,000.
- ii. Valencia United Methodist Church in Placentia built 7,000 square feet for \$112,000 or \$16.00 per square foot.
- iii. Allowing for 30% inflation during the coming year, it is conceivable that we could build a comparable building² for \$20.80 per square foot, or a total of \$124,800 for 6,000 square feet.

²The United Methodist Church of Valencia is not comparable in construction to either the aforementioned structures; it is much more expensive in design and construction.

8. Financing: how to pay for such a building?
 - a. The National Board of Missions will loan up to \$75,000 at 4 1/2%.
 - b. Conference Board of Missions may donate \$10,000.
 - c. We have approximately \$10,000 on hand.
 - d. We need an additional \$30,000, or about 25% of the total, or about \$500 per family (we now have about 70 church member families).
9. Monthly payments would not begin for at least one year. By maintaining our present rate of growth we will have 45 additional families in membership within one year.
10. Board of Missions' guidelines for indebtedness sets a maximum of \$750 per member family; thus, a membership of 100 families could carry a debt of \$75,000.
11. Repayment schedule:
 - a. Interest on \$75,000 @ 4 1/2% is \$3,375 or \$281.25 per month.
 - b. Repayment of principal in ten years would require \$625.00 per month.
 - c. We are now paying rent of \$240.00 per month.
We are now paying taxes of \$166.67 per month on church site.³
Present outlay per month is \$406.67, and we have nothing to show for it.

³Actually the Conference is paying this amount, but the point is that it is being paid.

Conclusion: by raising \$30,000 in cash and paying about two times per month what we are presently paying we could be in our own building!

APPENDIX D

A PROGRAM FOR THE ARCHITECT

UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF VALENCIA
BUILDING PLAN GUIDELINES
June 4, 1973

The building committee of the church is concerned with constructing a facility which is first and foremost a place of worship. It shall be a complex which represents architectural harmony with the surrounding community and expresses itself strongly as the center of Methodist worship. The complex shall meet the present needs of the congregation as outlined and shall be expandable to accomodate future growth within the limitations of existing real estate. This complex shall be so situated that the sanctuary will be the present and future focal point of the site. The basic design shall employ an enclosed or semi-enclosed patio.

Detail of Building Plan Guidelines

- I. Sanctuary. This unit shall be expandable and single purpose in nature. It shall be carpeted.
 - A. Capacity (nave seating)
 - 1. present - 150
 - 2. ultimate - 250
 - 3. glass - limited use, colored where possible, provision for memorial donations.
 - B. Configuration
 - 1. center aisle - wide enough for weddings

2. side aisles
3. rectangular in form
4. permanent pews are the ultimate goal

C. Chancel. This shall be the permanent unit and must convey the impression of strength and endurance.

1. raised above the level of the nave
2. altar -- allow pastor to face congregation from behind it
3. pulpit shall be fixed as will be the lecturn
4. communion rail shall be fixed (stationary)
5. sacristy for storage with easy access to chancel

D. Choir

1. processional
2. chancel seating

E. Organ presently owned shall be accomodated in future sanctuary

F. Narthex shall provide

1. fellowship hour after worship
2. possible room for expansion of sanctuary
3. wall as a buffer with possible glass

II. Church School. This shall be a multi-purpose unit to include Sunday school, assembly-meeting hall, and a planning option of weekday pre-school.

A. Configuration

1. permanent rooms
 - a. crib room - 8 to 10 cribs or sleeping spaces
 - b. toddler room

2. multipurpose rooms
 - a. nursery
 - b. kindergarten
 - c. 1st and second
 - d. third and fourth
 - e. fifth and sixth
 - f. Junior high
3. partitions - accoustically sound, track mounted.

III. Administration

- A. Three room complex, carpeted
 1. secretary/reception - 8' x 10' minimum
 2. pastor's office - 12' x 15' with half bath option
 3. work room - 10' x 12' option
 - a. storage
 - b. choir robes
 - c. office machines
 4. pre-school office - 10' x 12' option
 - a. also to be used as a church school office
 - b. requires doubling size of work room

IV. Kitchen. This facility should be situated to serve both the multi-purpose room and the narthex and should be 200 square feet minimum.

- A. Must accomodate restaurant type appliances eventually: stove, ovens, refrigerator, dishwasher and triple sink.

B. Cabinets shall be built in

V. Utilities

A. heated and air-conditioned throughout

B. ample storage

C. conduit for a/c additions, hearing aids public address system, etc.

D. over-size electrical service panel for future expansion

VI. Site improvements

A. parking lot

B. buffer wall

C. landscaping

APPENDIX E

Report to the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee on Housing

Result of brief study of housing allowances, ministerial salaries, and the apparent effect on duration of ministry in a given appointment, prepared for the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee, the United Methodist Church of Valencia, November 20, 1974.

There were two sources of the study. One was the Annual Conference Journal (1974); the other was a letter from Lawrence A. Hinshaw, listing the salaries on the Santa Barbara District. Associate ministers were excluded from the study. Churches offering housing allowances as opposed to parsonages and considered in the study are: Compton First, North Gardena, Long Beach California Heights, North Long Beach, Flagstaff Federated, Glendale Arizona First, Phoenix Crossroads, Phoenix Shepherd of the Valley, Claremont, San Dimas, Coronado, San Diego First, San Diego St. Paul, Brea, Laguna Hills Leisure World, Tustin, Whittier East, Chatsworth, North Hollywood First, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara First, Santa Paula First, Sepulveda, Ventura First, Woodland Hills First, Scottsdale Los Arcos, Tucson First, Glendale California First, Pasadena First and Pasadena Scott.

A sampling of one hundred and forty churches without giving consideration to housing allowances as opposed to parsonage revealed that the average appointment lasts 4.7

years. On the Santa Barbara District appointments paying less than \$10,000 ministerial support have an average appointment lasting only two years. Appointments on the same district where the salary is above \$10,000 have an average of 5.7 years. Thirty-one churches from across the Conference giving housing allowances to senior pastors have an average of 7.2 years in the present appointment. Pastor's salaries tended to be higher where the churches paid housing allowances; on the average the salaries were higher by \$2,389 per year. The pastors of these thirty-one churches reflect an unusually high percentage of former district superintendents -- 5 out of 31. The average housing allowance, including utilities (\$1,200 was used in cases in the Journal where no specific amount was used) for 1973 was \$4,175.

Some conclusions may be apparent. Churches paying less than \$10,000 total ministerial support need to pay more if they want their pastors to stay longer. In assessing the reasons for ministers remaining longer in one appointment, it may be difficult to isolate the specific issue of housing allowance as opposed to parsonage, but the whole issue of financial security cannot be ignored as a reason for longer pastorates. Ministers who stay less than four years tend to be less effective religious leaders, according to a recent study.

The pattern for the less effective person more frequently included the short pastorate, while the more effective pastor more regularly served

the parish at least four years. A very long pastorate of twelve or more years apparently did not affect the effectiveness rating adversely.¹

It appears that churches giving housing allowances tend to be more concerned for the overall material well-being of their pastors since they tend to pay larger salaries. (20.8% more than others). It may also be that they are wealthier churches or that high salary ministers more often prefer housing allowances than do low salary ministers. Likewise it may be argued that low salary pastors do not wish to purchase homes in low salary appointments lest it give an appearance of desire to remain in such a parish. One thing is certain -- ministers receiving housing allowances tend to stay in one location twice as long as the average secularly-employed person.

Based on 12 percent inflation for 1974 and 1975 the average housing allowance for 1975 will be \$5,237.12. (Also, it must be confessed that the housing allowance played a large part in the Valencia pastor's willingness to continue to work 70 and 80 hour work weeks. He reasoned that he could look forward to future year's of retirement security because he was able to invest in a home of his own.).

¹"Study Shows Mobile Pastor Less Effective," United Methodist Reporter, March 1, 1974, p. 3.

APPENDIX F

THE SERMONS

A word of explanation is in order on the inclusion of the sermons in this dissertation (project report of program development). The first sermon, a eulogy in Appendix A, reflects the writer's treatment of an extremely emotional funeral situation early in his ministry in Valencia. The second, titled "Why I Believe in the Church," is a fund raising sermon, which initiated the drive for \$15,000 in August, 1973, the pastor's first summer in Valencia. The third, titled "Getting Things Done," is a reflection of the influence of business management theory on the author in January, 1976. It is to be hoped that the readers of these sermons will be as understanding as were the parishoners. May God bless them with broad minds.

WHY I BELIEVE IN THE CHURCH

Where I served back in Indiana they kept possums for pets as well as dogs and cats. Instead of birds in cages they had hoot owls in their trees, and they had one local business that supported every able-bodied person who wanted to work; it was a meat packing plant. The business had been started by a Methodist layman who tried to live every day of the week as the preacher said on Sunday that he should. In the community where the business was located there was a thriving Methodist Church that handled its every member canvas just a little differently from the way most churches

do, and much more effectively, I might add, than we do here in California.

Before payroll checks and bonuses were written, the Methodist owner would walk through his plant and ask every employee how much he would donate for the budget of the Methodist Church. These pledges became payroll deductions. On the first Sunday of the year a new list of pledges would be posted in the narthex of the church on a bulletin board for all to read how much each had pledged.

As the business prospered so did the church, as you can well imagine. Eventually the owner delegated the responsibility for collecting pledges to one of his foremen. On one occasion the foreman came back to the owner without a pledge from a certain employee.

"Have him come to my office," instructed the owner. Within moments the employee was present in the office.

"Adam, I hear you refused to contribute to the church this year," began the employer, who not only owned the plant, but every inch of land within sight of his office.

"Yes, sir," said Adam. "And I think I need the money worse than the church does."

"Adam," began the owner, very slowly, "I promised God and the minister that I would not only underwrite this year's budget, but that I would increase it over what we gave last year. Further, I promised myself that every employee would give a tithe to the church or get a job somewhere else. Now, Adam, you know that I am a man of my

word, and I cannot go back on it."

On hearing that, Adam interrupted, "Well, sir, no one ever explained it to me so clearly before. I will be happy to pledge ten per cent to God and the church." Many a dollar was raised for the church in Indiana in that fashion.

This morning we have heard in detail from the building committee regarding our financial need and the generous offer of the Conference to give us two dollars for every one we raise. Unfortunately there is no business, local or distant, that underwrites the budget of this church. There are no wealthy persons to pick up the tab for what we fail to be able to pay; however, there are a few people, who are not necessarily the highest salaried among us, who have promised God and the church ten per cent of their income, even though there is no one who can or will fire them. If every member family of this church averaged \$10,000 a year income and tithed, the church would have \$70,000 a year to work with, and our \$22,000 budget would be no challenge at all.

Let me tell you why I believe in the Church and why I give to it. When I was a teenager I wanted to study medicine and make money; however, in my second year of college I became a drop-out, because I wanted to make money. I got a job, worked hard, got promoted, learned a little about accounting, and applied for a position with a large utility company. To my amazement I got the job, applied

myself, worked late at night when I knew the secretary-treasurer of the corporation would be by. With his blessings I was promoted, selected for further education, and would have been chief accountant at the age of twenty-four, had I not happened to meet two brothers, distant relatives of my mother, during a week-end at a youth camp. The story of these brothers' lives changed the course of my life forever.

These brothers had both started out to be ministers, just as I had. One was now a silver-haired orator of pulpit fame, a favorite of the youth, a denominational leader, and a man's man who could challenge the best in any young person. The other brother, though much younger, was obviously weary, won and sad. He had rejected the disciplines of the Christian faith, divorced his wife, drunken his way into alcoholism, and alienated himself completely from his family. He came to our youth camp to borrow money from his preacher-brother. This latter man, the older adults told me, had much more talent in his youth than the elder brother, but he had rejected the service of God to make money in the business world, and when I saw him, he was just one step above the gutter. Every line of his face cried out in defeat.

On viewing the contrasts between the two brothers, I silently determined that I would grow old with God, whether in business or in the ministry. I believe in the Church because it gave me object lessons early in life of the consequences of living for cheap values. I believe in the

Church because I want someone to challenge my children when they are grown with lasting values -- when they are grown and just old enough that they will ignore my advice -- then I want the Church to show those kids what really makes for a happy life.

I believe in the Church because I want someone who believes as I do to stand by my family when all that remains of this mortal flesh is cold and silent, and I want that person to proclaim the Good News of the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. I want someone who really believes in God to stand by and say, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, but the spirit has returned to the God who gave it. We commit this body to the ground in sure and certain hope of the resurrection and the life of the world to come, through Jesus Christ our Lord." I give to the Church because I want someone to proclaim my faith when I am no longer here to leave my witness.

When the time comes for the grandchildren and the great-grandchildren to be baptized I want someone who really knows God to take them in his arms, place holy water on their heads, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Then I want that person to be able to turn to an assembled congregation in a building where they are still making mortgage payments, and I want him to say: "Brethern of the household of faith, I commend to your love and care this child, whom we this day recognize as a member of the family of God." I give to the Church

because I want someone to baptize my children's children and their children after them.

Finally I want someone to tell my children and their offspring of the kingdom of God that is coming to earth. I want them to hear that one day the warriors will beat their swords into pruning hooks and their spears into ploughshares. I want them to be taught in the Judeo-Christian tradition and to know that God is in control of his universe. I want them to hear that love will overcome all evil, and I want them to know that whether they live or whether they die, they belong to God.

Someone may be asking, "Pastor, do you really believe all those ancient myths?" My simple response is only this: "I have given all of my life to those myths. With all of my heart I believe in the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Yes, I'm really hooked on them. Life's real values are the intangible ones."

Through the ages cultural and moral depressions, as well as personal depressions have come when people placed more emphasis on materialism than spiritually. Without exception the worst sin of the Bible has occurred when man thought more of his possessions than of his fellows or even himself. When the Israelites turned to Canaanite worship and involved themselves in temple prostitution it was in the hopes of gaining better crops from the influence

of the foreign gods. When they gave their children as sacrifices on heathen altars, it was an evidence of their desire for larger herds of animals and richer harvests. When they turned the temple into a center for trade, it was to gain money, not to glorify God. When Judas betrayed his Lord, it was for thirty pieces of silver.

When we build a church for our children, we are giving them a place where SPIRIT is shared, where they can experience SOUL, where they can be somebody, and REAL LIFE can be given to them. With "godly pride" we can point to the church and say, "Child, there is the institution that gave the world hospitals, colleges, universities, public schools, child labor laws, abolished slavery, supported women's right to vote, the labor movement, civil rights, and still offers the best hope for peace on earth." Further we might add, "Child, that institution and its teachings can keep you emotionally healthy, for it will remind you of the sinfulness of man, so that you will not expect too much from others or yourself. It will point you to the example of Jesus and the love of God, and the support of the Holy Spirit." Yes, I believe the Good News, proclaimed by the Church, is for my children, and so I give to the support of the Church.

Some of our members believe in the Church so much that they have already indicated that they will give \$1,000 to the building fund today. One man told me, "We are giving \$1,200." One has already given \$250. Others will

give \$500. Each one doing as he is able and has faith to give will make our goal of \$15,000 a mark to be sneezed at. If just fifteen families would give \$1,000 we would reach our goal immediately.

The ushers will now distribute pledge cards, but let us pray before we sign them. Let us all pray: "O God, help us to look to You, to our children, to our community, and to our blessings. Guide us in our pledging, and help us to know that what we do is done for your cause and Church, and not for the glory of man or minister, committee or congregation, but for God and for love and for truth and for justice in the world, now and forevermore. Amen."

GETTING THINGS DONE

For many years now I have held to a small degree of heresy -- to many a large degree, depending on the critics! I observed early in life that the people who get the job done, usually ignore some of the rules of the game.

Let me illustrate. Eleven years ago I attended a conference where the presiding minister heard a report read and motion made for adoption. Before a second could be heard to the motion he interrupted with the words, "Young man you couldn't get a Methodist bishop in a 100 years to approve that motion." Now according to Roberts' Rules of Order a motion must be seconded before it can be discussed, but here was a chief executive officer breaking the rules, because he couldn't abide the contents of the motion. What

gave him the right to interrupt? A big ego! That's all! I will never forget his anger because I was standing beside him, in front of hundreds of people, moving that the following year's annual conference be held in air-conditioned quarters in contrast to the hot, humid building where we were.

Yes, son, daughter, I hate to confess it, but my observation is that people who get the job done sometimes ignore the rules of the corporation.

The other day I was reading a book on management and a paragraph in it jumped out at me, and I want to share it with you this morning: It spoke to my frustrations of eleven years and more. Management is not my game, so perhaps I should have gotten wise a long time ago, but listen to this: "Human beings in organizations do not behave the way conventional organization theory says they should."¹ Now I have known that for a long time, but I have hesitated to say as much. I was raised in a normal, white, Anglo-Saxon family, that prayed, tithed, and attended church every time the doors were open -- and look where I ended up -- in a pulpit, but that is not my point. My point is that I long ago observed that people who get the job done frequently ignore the rules of the game; they did "not behave the way conventional organization theory says they should."

¹Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 36.

Let me quote again from that management text:

Every (manager) has been held formally accountable for things he could not possibly control. Some of the more successful ones have simply ignored the formal limitations and gone ahead to do what they knew would further organizational goals. They are usually known to top management as the men who 'get things done,' but there is little open acknowledgement of the fact that they often do so by violating the logical requirements of the formal organization.²

Violate the logical requirements! That's my heresy! People who get things done, do so at the expense of someone's rules. Now that sounds unsavory, unethical, ungodly, and dishonest, but I would warn you, IT'S BIBLICAL!

Take our scripture lesson this morning. The story of the wise men. They ignored Herod's law. "And being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they departed to their own country by another way." THEY DEPARTED TO THEIR OWN COUNTRY BY ANOTHER WAY! They broke their promise to the King. From the story of the wise men consider:

- 1) the political implications
- 2) the personal inconvenience
- 3) the promised intervention

THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS. Who were these wise men? Quite possibly they were wealthy Jews from Persia, offspring of forefathers who had been taken to Persia at the time of the collapse of the Second Kingdom in Israel in 586 B.C. Through the centuries their forefathers had worked hard to achieve success. When freedom was offered

²Ibid.

to Israelis in 537 B.C., and free camel tickets to Jerusalem, these families had elected to stay on in Persia. Centuries went by and their offspring became the learned men of their adopted nation, in which they had been born as slaves. Let's assume the wisemen were intellectuals from Persia, Jews by religious commitment, but Persians by nationality. Think of the risk they created for international relations by their refusing to return to Herod!

Perhaps we have difficulty in recognizing the acceptance of the wise men by Herod. Persia in many respects, was to Judaism, what Rome is to Christianity. For hundreds of years before Christ, and for thousands of years after Christ, Judaism flourished in Persia where there was freedom of religion, long before it existed in the West. Babylon was a second Jerusalem. When Jerusalem finally fell to the Romans it was to Babylon in Persia that the religious leaders of the Jews fled, and set up rabbinic schools. The Jews of Persia were the traders of the eastern world. They knew Marco Polo's trade route long before Mr. Polo knew Mrs. Polo!

Now let's take a second look at Herod. Herod was a turn-coat Jew who held political office only by compromise with Rome. He was a dangerous man who had held on to his political power for forty years by perpetual intrigue. To save office for himself he had his own sons put to death as well as his wife. He would pay any price to have his own way. The wise men were aware of Herod's reputation.

If the wise men did not return to Herod, he could

easily call up the Roman legionnaires and report that three foreign revolutionaries had escaped his custody, and were somewhere in Jerusalem or Palestine. Rome had long wanted to rule the entire world, but her war machine "had run out of gas" on the eastern slopes of the Mediterranean in conflict with the Arabs and the Jews. If peace could be made with the Jews, a highway could be established to the East through Palestine, and Roman armies could conquer the world in Caesar's name!

I think it is no overstatement to suggest that the wise men, on finding the new born King of the Jews, and refusing to report his location to Herod, were risking world war. How often in history, have nations gone to war over acts of one or two or three men?

Sigmund Freud was not the first to pay attention to his dreams. The wise men not only knew their stars, but they also paid attention to their subconscious motivations. Intuition told them to get on their camels and "hightail" it for home, and so they did, without consideration to political implications. Consider too, their personal inconvenience.

PERSONAL INCONVENIENCE. If the story of the good Samaritan tells us anything about first century life, it tells us that travel was dangerous. Highwaymen, robbers, and criminals lurked in every shadow. To return home another way for the wise men involved added personal inconvenience. Risk to life and limb was greatly multiplied

by avoiding the main highways.

Then too, think of Palestine's terrain. The desert and the mountains, the possibility of death by starvation and thirst. The late Bishop James Pike met his untimely death in Israel in our day with all of our modern systems of communication. No doubt the wisemen knew the main trade routes and stayed in the best inns, but what hope would there be for their safety as intellectuals, foreigners, and wanted men in Herod's province of Rome? They risked everything to obey what they believed was right in a bad situation. They did not behave as organizational theory and Herod believed they should. They obeyed their consciences rather than Herod. The political implications, the personal inconvenience, and the promised intervention. "Being warned of God in a dream. . . ," they received

THE PROMISED INTERVENTION. Conditions beyond their control and the established norms of good business and diplomacy got in the way. The rules had to be ignored. An emergency arose, and they were warned in a dream! God got through to the wise men in their dreams! Today we place little significance in dreams, but God still promises intervention, even when dreams go sour.

He or she who really gets things done will still listen to inner voice of conscience, of rightness, regardless of rules, not rightness for himself alone, but rightness conditioned and controlled by love as it affects all persons in a given situation.

The promised intervention of God in human affairs frequently comes only after much testing. With God only the tested are trusted.

The wisemen ignored the political implications, personal inconvenience, and received the promised intervention of God for their personal safety.

Their gifts of gold made possible the flight of Mary and Joseph and the baby Jesus to Egypt. They considered the welfare of the Child, not their personal safety and the Child was spared "and grew in wisdom and favor with God and man."

Herein is the lesson. When we consider the welfare of others above personal cost, God will take care of us, regardless of rules. May we take the risks necessary to get things done for God in our time. Amen.

INDEX

- Administrative Board, 92
- Advent, 82
- Agreement to Purchase, 8
- Amendt, Charles, 69
- American Builders, 77
- Anderson, Gerald, 72
- Anderson, Wilhelm, 72
- Andrus, Darwin, 34, 35, 42, 45, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 70,
101, 105, 106
- Arcadia United Methodist Church, 46
- Arnett, Dessie Ash and Lenace Robinette Clark, 47
- Arnott, Robert, iii, ix, 150, 151, 153, 154
- Augenstein, Leroy, 49
- Bahl, Gene, 76
- Bammel, Diane, 69, 74, 78, 79
- Bammel, Richard, 69, 78
- Baptist Church, Newhall, 7
- Barnard, Chester, 34, 108, 112, 128, 129, 130
- Bea, Cardinal, viii
- Berne, Eric, 66
- Bishop, 67
- Board of Global Ministries, National, 33, 34, 41, 44, 58, 59,
60, 70
- Board of Missions and Church Extension, 3, 4, 11, 14, 21, 38,
39, 55, 56, 65, 69, 106, 107, 109, 112, 124,
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, 125
- Bower, Robert K., 137, 139, 141

Boy Scout, 82
 Brister, C. W., 148
 Broadwater, Stephen, 30
 Brooks, Rev. Richard, 21, 32, 57, 94, 101, 109
 Brossmer, Rev. Dr. Fred, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 52, 53,
 92
 Bruce, Richard, 29, 79
 Bruhn, Charles, 60, 76, 79, 81, 85
 Bruhn, Donna, 74, 78, 79, 80
 Brunelle, Bill, Chuck & Sherry, 80
 Burns, Karen, 74
 Burns, Sam, 76
 California Gas Company, 11
 California Land Company, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
 Camarillo United Methodist Church, 32, 79, 83
 Canoga Park Methodist Church, 68
 Carlson, Martin E., 74
 Casterline, Forest, 79, 80, 81, 144
 Casterline, Mary, 79, 80, 81
 Chiles, Robert E. viii
 Christ Church, Norwalk, 39
Christian Century, 86
 Christmas trees, 82
 Circuit West, 39
 Clanton Block Company, 81
 Cobb, John, Jr., iii, 135
 College of the Canyons, 43
 Commission on Church Planning of the Council of Churches of
 Southern California, 4

Conference Board of Missions, 4, 8, 12, 13, 38, 56, 64, 65, 69, 122

Coots, Fred, 39

Craig, Florence, 79

Craig, Kenneth, 76, 78, 80, 81, 144

Cravener, Betty, 80

Cravener, Donald H., Jr., ix, 17, 28, 44, 52, 53, 57, 61, 62, 81, 105, 107, 120, 142, 145, 152

Cunningham, Clifton, 17

Denny's Restaurant, 18

Department of Architecture, New York, 35

Dick, Lawrence, 108

District Board of Building and Location, 26, 31, 32, 36, 43, 47, 50, 57, 61, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 140, 150, 152

Drucker, Peter, v, 29, 37, 114, 115, 132, 153, 154, 155

Dun and Bradstreet, 2

Duncan, Robert, A.I.A., 14

Edison, 29

Edwards, Dr. K. Morgan, iv

Ellingson, Herb, 78, 80, 144

Ellis, Jerry, 35

Elmore, Eugene, 32

England, vii

Engstrom, Ted W., 21, 24, 35

Episcopal Bishop, 18, 44

Escrow Agent, 64, 98, 99

Faramelli, Norman J., 147

Fetterolf, Travis, 30, 79

Fill Dirt, 5, 6

Fletcher, Joseph, iv, 48, 126, 129, 130, 136
 Fountain Valley, United Methodist Church, 39
 Friendly Valley, United Methodist Church, 3, 32, 33
 Fuller Theological Seminary, 139
 Galvan, Elias G., 20, 21, 58, 68, 70, 106, 111, 112, 113, 117,
 133, 134
 Garden Grove, 39
 General Motors, 29, 75, 142, 143
 Gerstenberger, Dan, 108
 Giddens, Al, 75, 76
 Gidel, Lorraine, 29
 Glen School, 7
 Gould, John C., 60, 61
 Grace Baptist Church of Newhall, 103
 Grading, 6
 Granada Hills, Knollwood United Methodist Church, 18
 Graves, Kathy, 74, 79
 Greenlee, Raymond V., ix, 17, 22, 23, 28, 50, 153, 165, 171
 Greenlee, Virginia Schaefer, 17, 22, 28, 69, 94, 167
 Harmon, Nolan B., 119
 Harris, Orren, 17, 23, 28, 77, 117, 142, 169
 Hart, Robert, 29
 Hart School District, 7, 12
 Harvard Business School, 129, 130
 Haynes, W. Warren and Massie, Joseph L., vi, 94, 107, 138
 141, 142, 149
 Heaton, Kenneth G., 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 35, 44,
 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62,
 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83,
 92, 94, 105, 106, 109, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 133

Heaton, Sylvia, 169

Henson, Tonia, 12

Hiebert, Lester L., 12, 19, 28, 57, 69

Hiebert, Ruth, 69

Hildebrand, Will, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21, 25, 44, 45,
46, 52, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70,
74, 101, 105, 108, 109, 110, 134, 153, 154

Hill, James, 108

Hillcrest Country Club, 81

Hinshaw, Lawrence A., 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 20, 24,
25, 29, 30, 45, 55, 59, 65, 68, 92, 101, 105, 134, 153,
154, 183

Hitchcock, William, 28

Hoffman Heating and Air-Conditioning of Reseda, 99

Hole, J. Wesley, 11, 20

Hon, Dan, 64

Human Relations School, 69

Iglesia de Christo, 39

Indian Guides, 22

Jacquet, Constant H., 38

Japanese Ministries, 39

Jesus, v

Johnson, Floyd, 77

Johnson, Richmond, 121

Johnson, Douglas W. and George W. Cornell, 72

Jones, Dallas, ix, 30, 75, 142, 143, 145

Jones, H. A., 77

Jones, Tracey K., 104

Jordan, Thatcher, 4, 5, 20

Junior Chamber of Commerce, 22

Kennedy, Bishop Gerald, 12, 118

Kirkman, John, 21, 26, 70, 98, 99, 105, 111, 112, 113, 114,
115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 133, 134, 146

Klein, Ronald, 143

K-Mart, 80

Knollwood United Methodist Church, 68

Korean Congregation, 39

Koski, Richard, 78

Kremer, Peter, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

Kung, Hans, 1

Lancaster United Methodist Church, 19

Leathers, Duane, 29

Leathers, Nancy, 17

Los Angeles County, 8, 32, 82, 103

Luther, Martin, vi

Marnell, William H., vi, vii, viii

Martin, Malachi, viii

Maslow, Abraham H., 101

Mastroleo, David, 17, 28, 81, 82, 99, 143

McBean Parkway, Valencia, 7

McConnell, William A., 72

McGregor, Douglas, 35, 36, 48, 109, 120, 140

Meadows School, 7

Meeks, M. Douglas, 61

Memorial Hospital, Culver City, 23

Michaelson, Burton, 33, 65, 83, 108

Miller, Donald G., 2

Miller, Ken, 108
Minter, Father Russell, 14, 16, 44
Moltmann, Jürgen, 89, 104
Moore, James, 76, 142
Mortgage, 39
Nagel, Rev. Arthur, 14
National Board of Missions, 19, 61, 71
National Division, 41, 42, 63, 97, 98, 105
Newhall Ranch, 4
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 51, 52, 89
Newhall Land and Farming Company, 4, 6, 7, 11, 53, 85
Newhall Park, 12
Oates, Wayne E., 132
O'Connor, Flannery, 86
Old Orchard Home Owners' Association, 22
Olsen Realtors, 7
Orange County, 39
Our Lady of Perpetual Help Roman Catholic Church, 75
Outler, Albert, 139
Overholtzer Furniture Company, 84
Pacific Palisades, 121
Packard, Vance, 73, 86
Paget, James, 75
Palm Desert, 62
Pannenberg, Wolfhart, 88
Pannikar, Raimundo, 148
Parsonage, 8, 37

Pasadena District, 10, 55, 91

Pastor-Parish Relations Committee, 19, 22, 53, 81, 92, 168,
183

Paul, Saint, vi

Phillips, Hilda, 74

Pike, Bishop James A., 49

Placerita Junior High School, 12, 15

Presbyterian Church, 32

Pre-school Committee, 85

Price, Carlitta, 79

Price, Edward, 33, 62

Price, John, 79

Price, Thelma, 79

Prudential Life Insurance Company, 22, 23, 167

Quit Claim Deed, 11

Ramsey, Paul, 48

Randles, Anthony, 8

Ricciardi, Robert, 12, 15, 32, 83, 155

Ritchie, Robert, 28

Roberts, Oral, 23

Robinson, John, A.T., 129

Rollins, William, 21

Rothchilds, 29

Ruether, Rosemary, 30

Rules, Conference, 25, 33

Rusack, Bishop, 44

St. John's Subdivision, 7

St. Paul, 63

St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, 7, 15, 16, 18, 43, 46, 51, 76,
120

Santa Ana District, 39

Santa Barbara District, 4, 15, 91

Santa Clarita Valley Escrow Company, 58

Schaefer, Lyle and Ginny, 69, 79

Scharer, Fletcher, 10, 11, 18, 25

Schuerger, Commander Dr. Richard, 78, 146

Scaduto, Anthony, 2

Security Pacific Bank, 52, 71

Seifert, Harvey, ix

Serling, Rod, 85

Service, Robert, 77, 78

Seventh Day Adventist Church, 15, 16

Shaw, Kenneth, 28

Sherman Oaks United Methodist Church, iii

Shippey, Frederick A., 121

Skidmore, Lee, 80, 81, 143

Skidmore, Steven, 81, 82

Small, William, 5

Smith, Charles Merrill, 156

Smith, Paul H., 41, 42

Soil Tests, 6

Southard, Samuel, 148

Southern California Gas Company, 11, 76

Stamper, Larry L., 18

Strom, Robert C., 72, 87

Structuralism, 151

Syd's Electric, 75
 Systems Theory, 69, 70
 Taxes, 11, 14, 15, 55, 56, 76
 Taylor, Rev. David, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 32, 52, 92
 Thomas, Carl, 87
 Thompson, Harriet, 143
 Title Insurance and Trust Company, 8
 Toney, Edward A., 8
 Torrance First United Methodist Church 52
 Tuell, Bishop Jack, 84
 United Methodist Development Fund, 63
United Methodist Reporter, 41, 42
 United Methodist Women of Valencia, 85
 University of Kansas, iii
 Uris, Auren, 114, 152
 Valley Federal Savings and Loan, 12
 Valley Street, Newhall, 7
 Van Cleave, Charles, 11
 Walles, William, 18
 Walters, Edith, 17
 Watkins, William Ward, 41, 45, 137
 Wesley, John, vi, 86, 139
 Wesley United Methodist Church, Woodland Hills, Ca., 47, 68,
 101
 Westlake Village United Methodist Church, 19, 92
 White, Gertrude, 29
 Whitefield, George, 86

Williams, Daniel Day, 135

Williams, George, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 25, 26, 55,
56, 57, 58, 64, 65, 67, 70, 74, 98, 105, 115, 134, 146

Woodruff, Woody, 76, 80, 81, 143

Youth, 85

Zoning Variance, 8

VITA

Kenneth G. Heaton

PERSONAL

Born: January 31, 1935, Zephyr, Ontario, Canada
Parents: James and Rose Rye Heaton
Married: Sylvia Caroline Matheson, June 27, 1959
Children: Kenneth Gordon, Jr., born September 29, 1961
Caroline Rose, born November 26, 1963

EDUCATIONAL

Public Schools, Toronto, Canada, 1941-1949
Oakwood Collegiate Institute, Toronto, Canada, 1949-1953
Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston, Massachusetts, 1953-1955
Emmanuel Bible College, Kitchener, Ontario, Canada, 1956-1957
A.B., Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois, August, 1961
B.D., Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri, 1967
Thesis: "Age Factor in Christian Conversion"
Th.M., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1970
Thesis: "Pre-Arminian Concepts of Free Will in England, 1520-1619"

BUSINESS

Production Control Clerk, Lever Brothers of Canada, Limited, 1955-1956
Paymaster and Accounts Payable, Etobicoke Electric Power Commission, Etobicoke, Ontario, 1956
Accountant, Gowing Plumbing Company, Galt, Ontario, 1957-1958
Stock Controller, Christie Bread Company, Galt, Ontario, 1959.

MINISTERIAL

Founding pastor, The Church of the Nazarene, Galt, Ontario, 1956-1959
Pastor, Church of the Nazarene, Tefft, Indiana, 1960
Pastor, Church of the Nazarene, Temperance, Michigan, 1961-1964
Pastor, Northside Church of the Nazarene, St. Joseph, Missouri, 1965-1967
Pastor, Central Barren United Methodist Church, New Salisbury, Indiana, 1967-1971
Associate Pastor, Lancaster United Methodist Church, Lancaster, California, 1971-1972
Pastor, United Methodist Church of Valencia, Valencia, California, 1972-1976